DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 324 006 IR 053 273

AUTHOR	Cummings, Martin M., Ed.
TITLE	Influencing Change in Research Librarianship. A Festschrift for Warren J. Haas.
INSTITUTION	Council on Library Resources, Inc., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	88
NOTE	112p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Historical Materials (060) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Libraries; Higher Education; International Cooperation; *Leadership; *Library Administration; Library Associations; *Library Education; *Library Science; National Libraries; Personal Narratives; Preservation; *Professional Development; Program Descriptions; Research Libraries; *Social History
IDENTIFIERS	Festschrift; National Library of Medicine MD

ABSTRACT

Ten friends and colleagues of Warren J. Haas, former president of the Association of Research Libraries, contributed the nine papers in this Festschrift honoring Haas on the occasion of his 65th birthday and the tenth year of his leadership as president of the Council on Library Resources. The papers, which describe Haas's role in significant library developments of the last 25 years, are: (1) "Warren J. Haas: The University Years" (Patricia Battin); (2) "President, Council on Library Resources" (Deanna B. Marcum); (3) "The National Bibliographic Program" (C. Lee Jones); (4) "RLG (Research Libraries Group) Revisited" (Rutherford D. Rogers); (5) "In Pursuit of Preservation" (Peter G. Winterble); (6) "Professional Library Education" (Robert M. Hayes); (7) "The Foundation Connection" (James M. Morris); (8) "The Art of International Librarianship: The CLR-IFLA (Council on Library Resources-International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions) Style" (Herman Liebaers and Margreet Wijnstroom); and (9) "Warren J. Haas and the Influence of His Publications" (Martin M. Cummings). An introduction, a biographical sketch of Haas, and a subject/title index are included. (SD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED324006

INFLUENCING CHANGE IN RESEARCH LIBRARIANSHIP

A Festschrift for Warren J. Haas

Edited by Martin M. Cummings, M.D.
with the assistance of Ellen B. Timmer

Council on Library Resources, Inc.
Washington, D.C.
1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ellen B. Timmer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR053273

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Council on Library Resources, Inc.
1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Influencing change in research librarianship.

Includes bibliographies and index.
1. Research libraries. 2. Library science.
3. Haas, Warren J., 1924– . I. Haas, Warren J., 1924– . II. Cummings, Martin Marc, 1920– .
III. Timmer, Ellen B.
Z675.R4515 1988 027.7'0973 88-37269

Contents

Preface		Martin M. Cummings	vii
Introduction		Maximilian W. Kempner	ix
Biographical Sketch			xi
Chapter 1	Warren J. Haas: The University Years	Patricia Battin	1
Chapter 2	President, Council on Library Resources	Deanna B. Marcum	9
Chapter 3	The National Bibliographic Program	C. Lee Jones	21
Chapter 4	RLG Revisited	Rutherford D. Rogers	41
Chapter 5	In Pursuit of Preservation	Peter G. Winterble	53
Chapter 6	Professional Library Education	Robert M. Hayes	59
Chapter 7	The Foundation Connection	James M. Morris	71
Chapter 8	The Art of International Librarianship: The CLR IFLA Style	Herman Liebaers & Margreet Wijnstroom	77
Chapter 9	Warren J. Haas and the Influence of His Publications	Martin M. Cummings	83
Index			103

Preface

Man's mind, once stretched by a new idea,
never regains its original dimensions.
Oliver Wendell Holmes

Only a few individuals have the insight to foresee the future and even fewer have the opportunity and talent to influence it. Warren J. Haas is such a person. I first came to appreciate his uncommon drive to upgrade professional librarianship and to improve library services when, as Director of the National Library of Medicine, I observed his commitment to improve library management and to establish book preservation programs as president of the Association of Research Libraries in 1970. My admiration was reinforced when I read his paper, "Management in Research Libraries: Implications for Library Education," which appeared in *Library Quarterly* in the fall of 1973.

Subsequently, I have been privileged to work closely with Jim Haas as a member of the CLR Board of Directors and consultant to the Council on Library Resources. For the past five years I have observed his energetic efforts to stimulate, support, and sustain advances in librarianship and the broader field of information science. Clearly, no single person could write of Haas's contributions to research librarianship with a familiarity that comes from a close association with his professional career. Therefore, in an effort to amplify my limited knowledge and confirm my esteem for his achievements and accomplishments, I asked a group of distinguished friends and colleagues if they would be willing to contribute to a Festschrift honoring Jim Haas on the occasion of his forthcoming sixty-fifth birthday and the tenth year of his leadership as president of the Council on Library Resources.

The contributors were asked to describe Haas's role in significant library developments in which he participated, for his contributions are often modestly concealed in the published record. Many committee reports do not clearly identify the source of seminal ideas or concepts. An example

---

Martin M. Cummings is Director Emeritus of the National Library of Medicine and a consultant to the Council on Library Resources.

of a recent important publication that appears without author attribution is *Brittle Books: Reports of the Committee on Preservation and Access* (Washington, D.C.: CLR, 1986). This report was prepared by Haas, whose anonymity I now violate. It is likely that many other significant reports concerned with library issues have been crafted by his fine "Latin hand" and disciplined "Germanic mind."

In an effort to provide some fidelity to the historical record, I have been assisted by Mary Agnes Thompson, who provided me with the curriculum vitae and list of publications. I take full responsibility for the review and abstracting of his publications. My intent is not only to show the scope and diversity of Haas's professional interests but also to reflect his persistence in the causes he championed—notably, the development of library cooperatives and consortia, improved library management, preservation of books and journals, nurturance of library science and research, and upgrading of the profession through improved education.

The impact of the initiatives he sponsored has been augmented by his skill in identifying and engaging outstanding associates in his professional and administrative work. Possessing the virtues of good sense, courage, resourcefulness, and endurance, he has a legitimate claim to being considered our nation's leading librarian. The testimony in this book of those who have known him well and worked with him should do much to justify such a claim.

The format and much of the editorial work represents the fine handicraft of Ellen Timmer, who served as a covert collaborator throughout the entire venture, especially the publication process. Jane Rosenberg performed the onerous but valuable task of compiling the index. Particularly, I thank Maximilian Kempner, Chairman of the CLR Board of Directors, for his enthusiastic approval of the project and his support for the publication.

Finally, and importantly, I thank the distinguished authors who have provided the historical insights and current observations that, in the aggregate, reveal the state of the art of research librarianship near the close of the twentieth century.

Martin M. Cummings, M.D.
December 1988

Introduction

Maximilian W. Kempner

Are libraries contributing to the information age, or are they being bypassed by the new technology? The task of the Council on Library Resources is to strengthen libraries as an essential resource for access to the world's published literature. No one has done more to achieve that goal than Warren J. Haas.

Jim Haas became president of the Council ten years ago, at a time when new electronic and computer systems were radically changing the ways in which information was being communicated. He sought answers to the economic, political, and technical questions that were raised by the utilization of these new methods of information transfer. He sought and obtained the advice of scholars and senior academic officers as well as of research librarians. He defined the issues. Through careful and well-considered analysis, he influenced the direction of modern librarianship in such areas as bibliographic control, preservation of brittle books, and professional library education.

He is a successful foundation leader. Having spent his professional life with libraries and the problems of access to information, he appreciates the potential and understands the needs. To donors, he has made a compelling case for the optimal functioning of libraries. These donors are now eager to support the programs of the Council. He requires high standards in the use of grant funds, from specific individual research to large-scale, institutional research projects.

The papers that appear in this Festschrift describe the most important library developments of the past quarter century. The authors are professional colleagues of Jim Haas who have been in a position to observe his contributions. Throughout, the reader will find evidence of his creative involvement.

Maximilian W. Kempner is Chairman of the Board of Directors, Council on Library Resources, and a partner in the law firm of Webster & Sheffield.

The attitude of Jim Haas toward problem solving is simple: to him, no problem is insurmountable. Where the need is clear, the problem can be solved, given sufficient time and persistence. He has the tenacity to look to the long term. He has the humor needed to deal with temporary setbacks and the vagaries of human enterprise. Not only does he give the *impression* of having things under control, but, with him in charge, they *are* under control. As head of the Council, he effectively uses the considerable talents of his colleagues and inspires them to expand their own horizons.

The papers contained in this book represent an intimate yet objective historical account of recent library advances. The reader will not fail to be impressed with the role that Jim Haas has been playing in pursuit of improved library performance for the benefit of current and future users of information. His special talents as librarian, manager, planner, and leader are reflected in the composite portrait of this extraordinary man.

Biographical Sketch

Warren J. Haas has been president of the Council on Library Resources since January 1, 1978. He came to the Council from Columbia University, where he was appointed university librarian in 1970. In 1972, he also assumed the position of vice president for information services. Mr. Haas earlier served as associate librarian at Columbia, 1961-66, and as director of libraries at the University of Pennsylvania, 1966-69.

Mr. Haas began his association with the Council in 1974, when he was elected to the Board of Directors. Currently, Mr. Haas chairs the Foundation Library Committee and is a member of the board of directors of the Library of America. A former president of the Association of Research Libraries, he has served as a member of the steering committee and governing board of the National Enquiry into Scholarly Communication and as a member of the National Commission on the Humanities and of the Science Information Council of the National Science Foundation. Other past board memberships include those of The Research Libraries Group and the Center for Research Libraries. As a consultant, he has assisted numerous universities, consortia, foundations, and architectural firms.

Born in Racine, Wisconsin, on March 22, 1924, Mr. Haas received a B.A. in history from Wabash College in 1948 and a B.L.S. from the University of Wisconsin in 1950. He received the Henry Elias Howland Memorial Prize from Yale University in 1980 and the 1984 Melvil E. Dewey Award from the American Library Association, and was elected a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1986. His honorary degrees include a Doctor of Literature degree from Wabash College (1983) and a Doctor of Humane Letters degree from Indiana University (1987).

CHAPTER 1

Warren J. Haas: The University Years

Patricia Battin

Jim Haas's distinguished career in librarianship covers a wide range of intellectual achievements and contributions. The fifteen years he spent in research library management represent, in a sense, an extraordinary example of his ability to translate into reality the substance of his theoretical analysis of the central role of the library in a changing scholarly environment. The record of the Columbia years resonates with all the themes articulated during his long career and stands as eloquent testimony to the imaginative creativity of his intellect in both theory and practice.

His managerial career included six years (1960-66) as Associate Director of Libraries at Columbia University, three years (1967-70) as Director of Libraries, University of Pennsylvania, and a return to Columbia as University Librarian (1970-72). In 1972, in recognition of his substantial managerial strengths and his perceptive predictions of the effects of technology on information systems, his responsibilities were expanded to include academic and administrative computing as Vice President for Information Services and University Librarian (1972-77).

To comprehend the full extent of his accomplishments at Columbia, it is important to understand the university environment in 1970. Columbia had just embarked on a painful process of recovery and renewal from the upheavals of the late sixties, a process which was to consume a full decade before the institution regained financial and intellectual equilibrium. The development campaign, for example, planned for the late sixties, was

---

Patricia Battin is President of the Commission on Preservation and Access; she was formerly Vice President for Information Services and University Librarian, Columbia University.

abandoned until the early years of the eighties. The legacy of the trauma of the sixties, preceded by the complacency of the fifties, was an institutional community racked by distrust, despair, and the emergence at Columbia, as elsewhere in the university world, of a shift in faculty loyalties and intellectual commitment from the institution to the discipline and an individual scholarly entrepreneurship. This trend, little recognized for years, was to become dangerously destructive to the cohesive community ethos so essential to the support of integrated information services in an academic environment increasingly dominated by technology, declining financial resources, and the fragmentation of highly specialized research directions.

The Columbia Libraries had begun to suffer a decline in financial support during the complacent years of the fifties as research programs expanded throughout the higher education community heedless of the implications for library resources, the publication explosion, and the increasing costs of computer technology. Haas was one of the few librarians and educators who recognized the serious import of this change for the viability of the traditional research library in a subtly changing scholarly environment. The immense injection of federal funds into research had brought about a staggering increase in demands for library services with no corollary financial support for those services.

The Columbia Libraries, along with its peers, reflected the characteristics of an established bureaucracy within an established bureaucracy. As Polykarp Kusch, Provost of the University, noted in an informal memorandum to Haas in 1970, "The budget carries a very large overhead of tradition and hereditary prerogative."[1] Recasting a venerable and venerated institution within this environment represented an awesome challenge.

The keynote of his tenure was struck early on. In a memorandum from Kusch to Haas in November 1970, Kusch recognized the essential qualities that would enable Haas to achieve his extraordinary success in transforming the nineteenth-century concept of the research library into a flexible series of capacities for a rapidly changing information world. ". . . I am reminded of the circumstance that you are the only officer of administration within the University who turns up in my office with a well-organized agenda of matters to be discussed. Your agenda is a most effective device for disciplined conversation and for defining agreements, disagreements, and matters for future conversation."[2]

The objective of Haas's agenda, broadly stated, was the promotion of the "rational development of information resources pertinent to university research and instruction in all fields and the creation of an integrated and effective service capacity involving libraries, computers, and communication and instructional technology—a capacity that it is intended will become an integral part of academic activity in the University rather than

simply an appendage."[1] He was a pioneer in his insistence on the development of new "capacities" rather than attempts to rely upon fruitless manipulations of traditionally static organizational structures. While the profession, as amply documented in the minutes of its various organizational meetings, focused on tinkering with interlibrary loan mechanisms, book budget traditions, borrowing privilege policies, and concern over the paucity of new skills and expertise in the library field, Haas continued to press for a creative analysis of the changing role of libraries. "Changes in the higher education community will change the capabilities and the nature of libraries as well—the libraries of 1940 and 1980 are totally different entities. Changes are not simply to do something more cheaply than we're doing it now, but to develop capabilities . . . . We need changes of various sorts. The message is: some fundamental thinking has got to be carried on now and for the next few years so that we dictate our own fate rather than having it done for us."[2]

This fundamental thinking was quickly translated into action at Columbia. Haas had chaired the Joint ACE/ARL Advisory Committee to the University Libraries Management Study in 1968/69, which resulted in the establishment of the Office of Management Studies at the Association of Research Libraries and the Booz, Allen & Hamilton (BAH) prototype management study of Columbia University Libraries, funded by the Council on Library Resources.

In a long letter to Fred Cole, President of CLR, in December of 1970, Haas outlined his concepts for the mission and organization of the research library to meet the needs of the coming decades.

1. We need to remember that our objective is education and that our administrative organization must be one that stimulates educational productivity and increases the educational impact of the library operation.
2. The "system" must be responsible to the current research and educational requirements of all groups within the University.
3. Any acceptable plan for the organization must enhance the role of librarians as active members of the educational community and as full participants in developing and implementing library programs.
4. The organizational structure should provide a capability for monitoring operations and service performance on a continuing basis.
5. The organizational plan should promote efficient use of human, financial, collection, and physical resources.
6. The organizational structure should promote and stimulate potentially meaningful experimentation and innovation.

7. The form of organization should promote development of a substantial capability for interinstitutional operations and arrangements.
8. The specifications for staffing must aim not only at qualitative and quantitative descriptions of the range of skills and abilities required, but they must also promote the concept that would see each individual staff member making full use of his abilities in his work.[5]

The BAH study initiated an enormous ferment of excitement and rejuvenation among the Columbia staff despite increasingly stringent financial circumstances and the lingering effects of the aftermath of the '68 Troubles. Haas set up a series of standing committees that actively involved approximately fifty staff members to consider and implement the issues outlined in his letter to Fred Cole. This kind of intensive staff involvement in the basic "recasting"—a word that was to become a vocabulary staple among the senior staff during the Haas period—of the research library represented a radical break from the autocratic traditions and bureaucratic structure of the older research libraries. The staff committees covered a wide range of topics including re-examinations of (1) traditional library functions such as collection development and preservation, the form and content of bibliographic records, and general services; (2) classification schemes for both professional and supporting staff personnel; (3) new research services for the traditional disciplines in humanities, social sciences, and sciences; (4) the emerging emphasis on computer applications; and (5) new concepts of interinstitutional cooperation.

In 1972, with financial support from the Council on Library Resources, Haas created a pioneering Library Planning Office to establish and institutionalize a continuing long-range planning process for the University Libraries. The office was notable for its lack of precedent not only in research libraries but in their host institutions as well. The Planning Office provided the focus to transcend the daily operational demands, to lay the conceptual and financial groundwork for the recasting process, and to identify and establish procedures for collecting the pertinent information. This prescient action was typical of Haas's managerial style and his conviction that the process of change required the institutionalization of an active planning effort based on a series of articulated objectives insulated from the demands of the operating environment but closely linked to it through an organizational structure characterized by intensive staff involvement.

Beginning with the BAH study, a study heavily influenced by Haas's ideas and insights, he proceeded to implement the objectives he had laid out in the letter to Cole. The staff reorganization recommended by BAH and subsequently modified by the Columbia staff established a structure

well ahead of its time, and now being recognized by Peter Drucker, among others, as mandatory for large corporations as they become information-based organizations. As Drucker writes, ". . . the typical business will be knowledge-based, an organization composed largely of specialists who direct and discipline their own performance through organized feedback from colleagues, customers, and headquarters."[9]

Perhaps the most striking feature of the new Columbia University Libraries organization was its emphasis on function. Eliminated were the traditional hierarchical positions of unit head and assistant, both of whom held essentially the same job description. Instead, the new organizational structure assigned specific functional responsibilities, with appropriate accountabilities, throughout the organization. For example, the second-level positions in the large, distinctive collections of Medicine, Law, East Asian, Art and Architecture, and Rare Books and Manuscripts were split into functional units providing access services and reference/collection management activities. The organization was essentially flattened to permit the broad delegation of authority and accountability to senior managers. Another significant innovation integrated the concept of multiple reporting relationships into the organizational structure, a concept based on the recognition of the complexity of the organization and the impossibility of compartmentalizing the functions of a knowledge-based operation. Decisions could no longer be made unilaterally or in a vacuum; the expertise of librarians working primarily with patrons in the public services area needed to be linked to the bibliographic and curatorial skills of the collection development staff. Such an organization required individuals who functioned well in a complex group process, who understood the validity of horizontal as well as vertical working relationships, and who were comfortable with ambiguity.

To meet this need, Haas turned his attention to identifying the appropriate mix of staff talents and to developing an environment hospitable to and supportive of growth and development. In cooperation with the new Office of Management Studies at the Association of Research Libraries, he embarked on the unprecedented course of providing some form of management training for the majority of the professional staff. His perception of the requirements for both administrative and academic talents led to the development of a personnel matrix composed of a series of position classifications, in terms of administrative responsibility, and a system of professional ranks, modelled on the academic criteria for Columbia University faculty but modified to meet the obligations of the library profession. This innovative matrix rewarded specialized academic development and achievement regardless of administrative responsibility and also provided incentives and opportunities for the development of talented generalist managers. This creative approach contributed heavily

to the development of the managerial capabilities Haas viewed as essential for the increasing complexity of the research library. Traditionally, too many librarians had moved into administrative careers because of the perceived financial and professional advancement rewards. The new Columbia system provided for satisfactory career advancement in both administrative and academic tracks, thus encouraging individuals to build on their strengths.

Standing committees of representatives from all levels of the professional staff were set up to establish criteria for initial position classification and continuing review as responsibilities changed. A Professional Review Committee was appointed to conduct a peer review process to recommend to the University Librarian those individuals qualifying for promotion in rank. The agreement of the Columbia administration to incorporate this unique personnel system into the Statutes of the University, with full statutory recognition of Officers of the Libraries as academic staff, reflects the university administration's esteem for Haas's leadership and respect for his perceptive judgment in developing talent for the future.

His conviction that the organization must encourage and support innovation and experimentation while continuing to provide the traditional services demanded by the academic programs found operational translation in a small unit attached to the Resources Group, with a far-ranging portfolio to develop new programs cutting across organizational lines. This approach proved to be highly effective in establishing new programs, breaking down traditional conceptions of turf and jurisdiction, and encouraging a new sense of organizational process and cooperative activities to meet service needs. Slowly but surely, the organizational ethos began to change from a commitment to maintaining the integrity of a traditional organizational structure to the exhilaration of molding the organization to meet the needs of the institution and the scholarly community.

Buried among his eight points was perhaps the most prescient of all—the conviction that the new organization must promote the development of a substantial capability for interinstitutional operations and arrangements. Haas's concept went far beyond the traditional consortial arrangements to envision a truly integrated cooperative structure that heavily influenced the management of local services and resources. His leadership, along with his peers at Harvard University, Yale University, and the New York Public Library, in the establishment of The Research Libraries Group was another example of his extraordinary ability to translate a prophetic concept into productive reality. Not only was the Columbia staff energized by his intense intellectual and physical energy to recast a creaking and cumbersome internal organization. They were at the same time being urged to pioneer in a new consortial venture that challenged their traditional assumptions and stretched their professional and managerial capac-

ities to the utmost as they strove to preserve the past, maintain the present, and create the future. It was both an exhausting and an exhilarating time to be at Columbia. Success of the magnitude achieved by Haas at Columbia requires more than brilliance and energy; his particular qualities of quiet support, acute perception of individual strengths and weaknesses, and incisive analysis of complex problems inspired his staff to perform their personal best. He was known by all as "Dial-a-prayer" because of his uncanny ability to provide the salient insight that led to the solution of complex and seemingly insoluble situations.

In September 1974, almost five years after Haas had set into motion his long-range agenda, Columbia University held a planning retreat at Arden House. Haas's five-year plan prepared for that conference reflects his extraordinary ability to understand the import of the changing role of libraries and his capacity to provide a productive response. He correctly predicted the characteristics of the future operating environment. He envisioned costs outpacing income and the expansion of the obligations of libraries as the volume of recorded information continued to grow and academic programs changed. He foresaw in particular the implications flowing from the continuing application of technology, including the need for shared resources, new financing strategies, and a series of legal and philosophical concerns. He offered the university a new agenda to "create a capacity for change without dictating prematurely the kinds of change required to meet future needs."[7] His leadership qualities were once again recognized in a letter from the Director of Development, in which he noted that "you should have had more time to do what you do so well—articulate brilliantly the themes and needs of the Columbia libraries."[8]

If these accomplishments had constituted the sole record for the University Years, that achievement would be extraordinary. But such was not the case. Haas was not only a thinker, but an energetic doer as well. During this same time, he pursued an active leadership role in a variety of external professional activities and oversaw the management of a lively local enterprise. The Columbia University Libraries, because of the university's heavy emphasis on graduate instruction and faculty research, are intensively used. Approximately ten thousand to fifteen thousand people use the Columbia Libraries *each day*. During the Haas era, new library buildings were built and older ones renovated, collections were reorganized and moved, a Preservation Office was established, and computing operations were defined and stabilized. As Haas noted in a letter to a colleague, "I am sorry that I can't spend the time a detailed critique would require, but life here is not tranquil."[9]

Perhaps two tributes fittingly describe the distinction of the Haas years at Columbia University. At his farewell party, the members of his staff presented him with two door handles, encased in lucite, removed from a

renovated library. The handle on one side bears the word PULL and on the other PUSH in affectionate gratitude for his insistence on professional excellence and performance. The Provost of the University, W. Theodore deBary, summed up the university's gratitude in a last letter to Haas: "I am very much impressed by your five year report for 1972-77 with its lucid and—considering the range of subjects covered—succinct presentation of the progress of the University Libraries as well as their problems and needs.

. . . let me congratulate you on winding up a period of distinguished service to the Libraries with an equally distinguished report to the University."[10]

The quality of library management, like teaching and research, can be assessed on two levels: the visible and the invisible. How does one measure the impact of an extraordinary leader on his colleagues and associates as well as on the future of the organization? In the case of Jim Haas, those of us who worked with him know full well the enduring significance of his contributions to the success of the Columbia Libraries and the professional talent he developed and nurtured to respond to the demanding requirements of the decade of the eighties. It could well be, if such things could be measured, that the invisible record of his service will prove to be far more distinguished than the accomplishments apparent to the University at the time of his departure.

Notes

1. Informal memorandum from Polykarp Kusch to W. J. Haas. Undated.
2. Polykarp Kusch to W. J. Haas, November 4, 1970.
3. W. J. Haas. Miscellaneous Papers.
4. Transcript of discussions of Advisory Committee to Mathematica study of the economics of libraries, 1972.
5. W. J. Haas to Fred Cole, December 30, 1970.
6. Peter F. Drucker, "The Coming of the New Organization," *Harvard Business Review* (January-February 1988): 45.
7. W. J. Haas to Library Planning Council, September 27, 1974.
8. Peter Buchanan to W. J. Haas, October 1974.
9. W. J. Haas to Foster Mohrhardt, April 27, 1972.
10. W. Theodore deBary to W. J. Haas, January 30, 1978.

CHAPTER 2

President, Council on Library Resources

Deanna B. Marcum

This chapter on Jim Haas's presidency of the Council on Library Resources is a status report, for his work is very much in progress. It will be left to a future biographer to review the complete story, but after a decade of consistent leadership, it is possible to identify the issues he believed to be most important and that constituted the core of the Council's program.

The chronology of events is fairly straightforward. Warren J. Haas was elected president at the November 12, 1977, annual meeting of the Council on Library Resources to succeed Dr. Fred C. Cole as President on January 1, 1978. At the time of his appointment, Jim was the University Librarian at Columbia University and had been a member of the CLR Board for three years. His passion for research librarianship was well established, and his leadership qualities abundantly in evidence.

Today, a decade later, a long recitation of accomplishments and advances would have to be listed if the contributions of Jim Haas were to be fully acknowledged. But the annual reports of the Council provide a carefully detailed record of programs and projects. My intent here is to delve more deeply into a few representative efforts that I judge to be most important in the history of CLR. Jim Haas would be quick to point out that CLR is a catalytic agent. Throughout its history, the Council's work has depended upon the willingness of interested individuals and organizational representatives to take part. In that respect, the history of the several programs I will describe is, in fact, a collective history, but Jim Haas has

Deanna B. Marcum is Vice President of the Council on Library Resources.

skillfully and subtly pointed the direction. That so many have been willing to work on his agenda is the ultimate tribute to his genius.

The programs of the Council over the last decade are good indicators of Jim Haas's evolution in thinking. When he assumed the presidency, CLR was intensely involved with the development of a bibliographic structure that would serve the country. Computerization of library operations and the agreement to follow standards for the form and content of bibliographic records gave rise to bibliographic networks for providing cataloging services to a large number of libraries. That single development remains the most important factor in lowering the per-title cost of processing library materials. Although the need for this kind of sharing of bibliographic resources was well articulated before 1978, the structure for sharing bibliographic information was not yet in place. The Bibliographic Service Development Program (BSDP)—which had separate funding, its own program officer (C. Lee Jones), and an advisory committee made up of administrative officers of the key organizations—provided the framework for moving from a highly decentralized system of library users being confined to the use of local resources for study or research to a national and international web of bibliographic records that is available to all library users who have a need to know. More comprehensive coverage of the Bibliographic Service Development Program is found in Chapter 3.

The ease of sharing machine-readable bibliographic information forced the consideration, as early as 1977, of how individual libraries needed to be organized if they were to be able to share the information itself. The CLR staff had been working for several months with other agencies to carry out a plan for delivering resources from one location to another as needed.

In November 1977, the Library of Congress requested that CLR prepare a technical development plan for a U.S. National Periodicals Center. The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS), in its *Effective Access to Periodical Literature: A National Program*, recommended that the Library of Congress assume responsibility for developing, managing, and operating the Center. CLR was asked by LC to formulate a plan for implementation. *A National Periodicals Center: Technical Development Plan*, authored by C. Lee Jones, who worked as a consultant to CLR, was produced after wide consultation with the research library community. It is ironic that one of the first activities undertaken by Jim Haas proved to be, in retrospect, the most difficult. The information industry and publishers were alarmed by the possibility of reduced subscriptions from libraries, but worse, different segments of the library community were unable to reach consensus on a course of action. The plan for a national resource-sharing program foundered in the chaos. Jim Haas was

deeply disappointed by the profession's fragmentation. The experience was sobering for all who worked on the plan. Perhaps it was the harsh reality of how difficult it is to reconcile differing points of view that led to a fundamental shift in CLR's approach and program interests.

Preservation

From its earliest days, the Council on Library Resources funded preservation activities. With support from CLR, the Barrow Research Laboratory was established in 1961 by W. J. Barrow in Richmond, Virginia, to investigate the effects of temperature and humidity on the longevity of book papers. The research results were important in informing librarians about optimum storage conditions for book collections. Mr. Barrow also conducted early research into deacidification processes that might be used to arrest paper deterioration.

Jim Haas became acutely aware of the preservation problem while he was University Librarian at Columbia University. The library's physical conditions, combined with urban environmental problems, had been especially hard on an old, established research university's collections.

Since book deterioration plagued the oldest research libraries, members of the Association of Research Libraries agreed to take collective action. In 1962, ARL commissioned Gordon Williams to study the preservation problem in American libraries. Williams's report, issued in 1966, acknowledged the importance of coordinated effort if a solution was to be realized.[1] Conferences and meetings explored the breadth and depth of the preservation issue, but few concrete actions were taken. Still convinced of the necessity for collective action, ARL commissioned another study in 1972, funded by the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This time, Jim Haas was persuaded to conduct the investigation into ARL's failure to implement the recommendations of the Williams report. In his report, Jim Haas articulated plans for a national preservation program.[2] Although action on the report was inconsequential at the time, the 1972 plan proved to be the basis for a successful attempt to preserve the nation's published intellectual resources.

Once established as CLR President, Jim Haas concluded that the deterioration of book collections was only growing more serious. He decided to try one more time to bring the seriousness of the situation to the attention of university policy makers. The Council on Library Resources joined with the Association of American Universities to establish task forces to study the five topics related to research libraries that seemed to be most important to the entire university community; preservation was one of those topics. Many of the findings from earlier reports were discovered anew by this more broadly representative university group.

The task force on preservation and access evolved into an independent committee that, in turn, established in 1986 a permanent body, the Commission on Preservation and Access. Jim Haas served as the Commission's interim chairman until August 17, 1987, when Patricia Battin assumed the title of president of the Commission. By fall 1988, the elements of a national preservation program were firmly in place and the prospects were excellent for finally solving the most urgent preservation problems.

Professional Education

In one of his earliest addresses to his former ARL colleagues, Jim Haas identified professional education as one of his priority programs. Convinced that library schools were not well positioned to respond to the needs of university libraries for better-trained staff, CLR named a prestigious Professional Education and Training for Research Librarianship (PETREL) advisory committee, chaired by Haas's long-time friend John McDonald, Library Director of the University of Connecticut. (Their mutual interest in bird watching was instrumental in selecting the acronym for the Committee.) Other members of the committee were Russell Bidlack, Dean of the Library School, University of Michigan; Margot McBurney, Director of Queens University Library and the chairperson of ARL's professional education committee; W. Boyd Rayward, Dean of the Graduate Library School, University of Chicago; Rutherford Rogers, University Librarian, Yale University; and Robert Vosper, University Librarian Emeritus, University of California, Los Angeles.

The advisory committee identified three directions for the new PETREL program: recruitment to the profession of the "best and brightest" among liberal arts students; enhancement of managerial skills among those already in the profession who were likely to become leaders in the future; and frontiers conferences to give already established library leaders an occasional glimpse into the future.

The initial grants in the program went to library schools at the University of Chicago, the University of Michigan, and the University of California, Los Angeles. The Graduate Library School and the Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago, established a postgraduate program leading to a certificate of advanced study in library management. The School of Library Science at the University of Michigan began an active recruiting program designed to attract a small number of highly qualified candidates to specialize in research librarianship. The Graduate School of Library and Information Science at UCLA developed two programs: the Senior Fellows Program to provide specialized training for individuals who had recently assumed major management posts, and the first of a series of conferences designed to explore and describe the frontiers of research librarianship.

The objective of these conferences was to relate research library development and operations to economic, technological, political, and intellectual facts that promised to dominate policy making for the next decade. The effects of this program are analyzed in Chapter 6.

In 1988, the professional education program was restructured considerably, in part because Jim Haas recognized the problem of concentrating on library schools in isolation. The schools' small size and relative isolation on campus make change, even with grant support, quite difficult. In his report on the CLR program, Jim Haas explained the situation in this way: "Professional education, with its mix of strengths and problems, is not yet up to the task of fueling the future with women and men of the quality required to do the job. In terms of the CLR role, we can find ways to help more individuals because we have shown we are able to do so. And even though the way is not certain, our advisors, both librarians and educators, assert that CLR must assume at least some of the responsibility for promoting, through academic means, the cause and substance of the profession itself."

How such a structure that incorporates library schools, library administrators, and academic officers can be established to guide effectively the directions of professional education remains an unanswered question in the summer of 1988, but there is a plan for appointing a Committee on Information Studies that will include all three groups. The objective of the Committee will be to define and give visibility to the discipline of information studies and to identify the people best able to help give it shape and substance.

As important as it is to redefine the profession, there is also a great need to provide continuing education for those already at work in librarianship. Over the last decade, new opportunities for individuals have been offered. Since 1970, some four hundred individuals have been the beneficiaries of CLR research grants, fellowships, or internships. The two new programs to support individuals introduced during Jim Haas's tenure were the Faculty/Librarian Cooperative Research grants and Internships for Recent Graduates of Library Schools. The cooperative research grants were designed to encourage librarians with little research experience to collaborate with an experienced faculty researcher in conducting research. Some seventy-five teams of researchers had been funded as of July 1988, and the publications resulting from their research efforts are highly visible in the professional literature.

The second innovation, Internships for Recent Graduates, called attention to the research library's responsibility in educating new professionals. The program encourages libraries to design internships for those librarians on the staff who have recently earned master's degrees in library science. The internships should serve to broaden the new librarians' understanding

of the "bigger picture"—i.e., the nature of scholarly research and the role of the library as a link in the chain of scholarly communication. Multiple-year programs at five institutions gave opportunities to approximately eighty-five beginning professionals to gain a better understanding of the research university context in which they worked.

Continuing education for those librarians already established in the profession also deserved attention, because the requirements of the future research library were expected to be far more demanding. There was little evidence that library education of the past had adequately prepared current librarians to cope with the extraordinary demands of a changing profession.

Managerial training had been identified as a fundamental requirement by Jim Haas while he was the University Librarian at Columbia. He collaborated with the Association of Research Libraries and the Council on Library Resources in hiring the Booz, Allen & Hamilton consulting firm to spend a year at the Columbia University Libraries to design an organizational structure more responsive to contemporary needs and, at the same time, to work with Duane Webster, newly hired by ARL, who would serve as a kind of apprentice on the Columbia project for a year. Later, Duane Webster would become the director of a new division within the Association of Research Libraries, the Office of University Library Management Studies. The name of the division was simplified in 1978 to the Office of Management Studies (OMS), but the purpose remained fairly constant—to provide assistance to library staffs in undertaking management reviews and organizational restructurings and to offer the management training needed to improve library performance.

Jim Haas had an intense personal interest in the OMS from its earliest days and continued to support its activities after moving to the Council. In 1978, CLR joined with several other foundations to fund the Academic Library Program, administered by OMS. The purpose of the program was to extend the benefits of the OMS programs, then available only to research university libraries, to two- and four-year liberal arts colleges, thereby opening an additional path to link libraries with related missions. As part of the program, librarians were trained to serve as management consultants to collegiate institutions, working first with OMS staff and then independently.

In 1982/83, the ARL Office of Management Studies was funded to develop the National Collections Inventory Project in an effort to create the tasks and procedures needed to describe collections across a wide spectrum of research libraries. The inventory effort was based on The Research Libraries Group's program to construct a collections conspectus. CLR funding was used to develop a manual for use by bibliographers and to design training programs for participants in the majority of ARL libraries.

Another CLR grant was made in 1983/84 to the Office of Management Studies to design an Institute for Library Educators, a three-week program for faculty members who specialize in academic/research librarianship. Second and third institutes in 1986 and 1988, respectively, were also funded. Through this program, some forty-five library school faculty were immersed in the contemporary challenges faced by research libraries.

The Academic Library Management Intern Program offered another type of opportunity for individuals who wished to strengthen their managerial skills. One-year internships for individuals in a major research library were first offered during Fred Cole's tenure as president of CLR, but they were continued by Jim Haas. As of 1988, fifty librarians had benefited from the intern program; nearly all of them now hold top-level management positions in research libraries.

This list could be continued at length. The point is that Jim Haas, following in the tradition established by his predecessor, has been fully committed to identifying librarians with exceptional skills and talents and giving them opportunities to excel in their chosen profession. It would be difficult to calculate the large number of librarians who owe a debt of gratitude to the commitment of CLR and its Board to individual opportunity. The scope of these programs indicates the intensity of Jim Haas's commitment to identifying the most talented librarians and offering them opportunities to gain distinctive experience.

The Library in the Research University

The program areas of bibliographic services, preservation, and—to a lesser extent—professional education were more or less in place before Jim Haas assumed the presidency of CLR, although he quickly imprinted his own style and philosophy on all three as he directed their activities. But he was not satisfied with improving library operations. Jim Haas's single most important contribution to the Council on Library Resources has been his insistence that the research library be examined in the context of the university, because the day of the autonomously operating library was over.

From earlier administrative experience, Jim Haas knew that the librarian had a difficult time in capturing the attention of university officers. Realizing that the fundamental change going on in research libraries would have enormous implications for library users as well as for those university officers who must ultimately pay the bills, Jim Haas worked hard to build a cadre of informed leaders who could take the initiative in educating the university community.

With grants from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and the National Endowment for the Hu-

manities, the Council on Library Resources and the Association of American Universities joined together to develop a project to study the problems confronting the nation's research libraries. Five task forces, made up of university officers, teaching faculty, and librarians, were formed to consider the most important issues: bibliographic systems, resource sharing, preservation, technology, and professional education.

The reports of the task forces were important documents in and of themselves but, in the long term, the process of building teams of people from various parts of the university structure was Jim Haas's most important act. From the task force reports, an agenda for future collaborative action was set.

In 1985, the CLR Research Program was established. The impetus for the new program was Jim Haas's concern about the university's ability to plan for its information resources in the future. The program was announced as an incentive to "encourage exploration—through analysis, research, experiment, and discussion—of many important topics pertinent to providing and managing the information resources needed for teaching and scholarship."[1] Two kinds of grants were available through the research program: institutional grants to help universities with their strategic planning, and grants to individuals who would conduct research on characteristics and uses of information by discipline.

The first large institutional grant was made to the University of California, Los Angeles, in 1986. Program director Robert M. Hayes, Dean of the Graduate School of Library and Information Science, assumed responsibility for coordinating the long-range strategic planning process for libraries and information resources in the research university. Subsequent grants to facilitate other planning efforts were made to the University of Minnesota and the University of Illinois at Chicago. The University of Minnesota established a model information center within its Hubert Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs with its grant; the University of Illinois at Chicago added two librarians to the Humanities Institute in order to study the information-seeking behavior and library resources requirements of humanities scholars.

The individual grants were important both to the institutions receiving them and to the Council as it attempted to shape the research program. For Jim Haas, the quest for a greater sense of cohesion has been continuous, and he was not convinced that the changes that occurred as a result of the research grants would have enough immediate influence. He established a Research Library Committee to provide the unity that had been lacking. The pattern followed was similar to those established earlier in Jim Haas's tenure: university officers, scholars, archivists, and librarians were asked to take part in this enterprise sponsored by the Council on Library Resources, the American Council of Learned Societies, the As-

sociation of American Universities, and the Social Science Research Council.

In 1988, the Research Library Committee had met twice and was still developing an agenda for long-term action, yet a few themes were clearly discernible. The role of the library in the research university dominated the agenda. Closely related to that issue were the changing needs of scholars in different disciplines for library and information services. Jim Haas was convinced that these broad policy questions could not be answered by librarians working independently. If research libraries were to flourish into the next decade, the entire university community must have a better awareness of what was at stake.

If research libraries are to be responsive to the changes wrought by new technology, librarians must have an in-depth understanding of how researchers do their work. Only with full knowledge of the scholarly process can librarians see to it that technological applications are productive and beneficial. Scholars and administrators, on the other hand, must be apprised of the costs associated with the introduction of new information storage and retrieval methods. Priorities and needs for library services must be established in a realistic context. The Research Library Committee was established so that the necessary discussions could take place.

Summary

The Council on Library Resources does not have a corporate identity. The foundation's role is closely tied to the personal interests of its leaders. Before Jim Haas was named president, CLR was more like the traditional foundation that responds to the requests it receives. Perhaps because he was appointed while he was in a highly visible position at Columbia University, Jim Haas changed the way CLR would function. He had been very active in the Association of Research Libraries and the Research Libraries Group. Unlike his predecessors, Jim Haas had been closely linked to the library community at the working level. It is not surprising that he emphasized the status of the Council on Library Resources as an operating foundation. This status allows for the foundation to go beyond simply making grants to initiating and managing programs of its own. Within this structure, CLR has taken on its most important work: the Bibliographic Service Development Program, establishing a national preservation program, starting an intensive revision of professional education, and organizing the Research Library Committee.

While working within the operating structure was crucial for a more expansive Council on Library Resources, it also raised questions in the minds of some library directors. Accustomed to applying directly to foundations for grants, librarians were worried when Jim Haas became the

chairman of the Foundation Library Committee. Many of the major private foundations with an interest in research libraries agreed to participate in the meetings, held two or three times a year. Some of the foundations announced that CLR would serve as a kind of advisory body when library grants were under consideration. Some of Jim's former colleagues were not pleased about the increased visibility of CLR. It took several years of watching for research library directors to realize that Jim Haas was probably the only librarian who could attract the attention of foundation presidents and university officers in an effective way. Even when librarians did not appreciate the role Haas played, virtually everyone admired his leadership abilities in the larger arena.

Jim Haas once told me that he had not actively sought jobs during his career. Rather, he did what other people thought he alone could do. In order to take on the very demanding leadership role the CLR Board considered necessary if the research library was to flourish, Jim Haas left dynamic Columbia University to move to a small office environment in Washington, D.C. The management skills he had perfected as director of a large university library were not nearly as important in the new setting. Instead, he found it necessary to turn his attention to analyzing the national library situation and identifying the few things that could be done only by an organization such as the Council.

Having been an influential leader within the Association of Research Libraries, Jim Haas found it difficult to ignore the many ideas his former colleagues had to offer about the best uses of foundation funds. Perhaps the best indicator of Jim Haas's leadership strength was his total commitment to the three or four areas he identified to become the focus for CLR's program. He has concentrated on what he believed to be the topics of fundamental importance to research librarianship, and he was willing to take on the very difficult issues because there was no one else to do so. His perception of the task is best summarized by his introduction to the Council's 1985 *Annual Report*:

> The Council on Library Resources is essentially an agent for others—for libraries and librarians, to be sure, but also, in library-related matters, for university officers, faculty members, learned societies and academic organizations, and many individuals, not readily categorized, who are interested in and understand the importance of libraries. Indirectly, at least, we are also the agents of the foundations that fund us. The program described in this report . . . is thus not one of our own creation. Instead, it grows from what we hear and reflects the priorities we sense.
>
> One might expect, given the diversity of our advisors, that what we do would be fragmented and diffused. That is not really the case.

There is an underlying uniformity of purpose in the activities of each of the three components of our program: research, exploration and installation of improved operating capabilities, and librarianship itself. One way or another, the intent in all cases is to reshape academic and research libraries so that their strengths are retained while they add the new capabilities the future demands.

At heart, the task is one of management—how will libraries redefine and meet their obligations in intellectually, economically, and socially appropriate ways? There is a tendency to rely on evolution, but evolution is too slow and unpredictable, given the opportunities offered by fast-moving technology and the hazards to scholarship of forces that see information more as a commodity than as a public asset. Librarians, with the help of many others, need to shape the future rather than wait for it to happen. CLR, as an agent, can help; the work itself will have to be done elsewhere.

Notes

1. Williams, Gordon R. "The Preservation of Deteriorating Books." *Library Journal* 91 (1966): 51-56, 189-94.
2. Haas, Warren J. "Preparation of Detailed Specifications for a National System for the Preservation of Library Materials." Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1972.
3. *Thirty-first Annual Report, 198*", 11.

CHAPTER 3

The National Bibliographic Program

C. Lee Jones

Historic Perspective

One can postulate that the first steps toward a national bibliographic program were taken late in the last century when the Library of Congress (LC) began marketing catalog cards and so began to share LC cataloging. The purchase of—and, later, subscription to—the LC card set provided libraries with an option to accept the cataloging effort expended by a large group of well-trained catalogers, all adhering to a common set of standards. New options for management of the cataloging process had been created; managers could choose between capitalizing upon cataloging effort already expended or spending scarce resources to create institution-specific versions of the same data now available from LC. Few dispute the allegation that LC cataloging is done in the context of a large, single collection, a context that was often attacked as producing inappropriately complex cataloging copy for other institutions.

Printed union catalogs of materials processed by LC, supplemented with contributions for other research libraries, represented the next level of what would become the "national bibliographic program." A library could subscribe to the National Union Catalog (NUC), select required cataloging copy, use it as found, or alter it for local purposes. Thus, an even wider range of options for institutional bibliographic processing became available with the advent of the NUC.

C. Lee Jones is President of the Mid-Atlantic Preservation Service; he was formerly a Program Officer of the Council on Library Resources.

The burgeoning publishing industry required the library world to produce increasing numbers of bibliographic records, and computing was soon recognized as having a role in any rational bibliographic control system. An early application of computing to library operations was the distribution by LC of machine-readable bibliographic records. As individual libraries began to use these records to support a variety of library processes such as local cataloging, a certain degree of bibliographic anarchy became yet another management option. A library or other organization might acquire or write software to use the LC machine-readable records for an institution-specific system or it could share the costs of the system by extending access to other institutions. For a number of reasons, the Library of Congress was unable to take a direct, strong leadership position by sharing its internal processing system or specifying what an "ideal" system should be capable of doing. Instead, LC chose to encourage the standards community to adopt its own internal processing format as the format for the exchange of bibliographic records among computing systems, a standard that came to be known as MARC, or MAchine-Readable Cataloging.

The adoption of the MARC record format and LC's distribution of the MARC record set on tape, by subscription, provided a stable bibliographic record environment in which a number of networks began to provide shared cataloging services to their membership. Slowly, the stronger networks asserted themselves until, in 1988, the two major not-for-profit bibliographic networks—OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc., and The Research Libraries Group's RLIN (Research Library Information Network)—account for substantially all of the shared bibliographic services sold in the U.S. The Western Library Network (WLN) and a number of proprietary bibliographic services account for the balance of service provided, probably less than 5 percent of the total.

To the extent that each of the providers of bibliographic information cooperates with the others and, in fact, shares unique databases, there now exists a nationwide bibliographic service program. However, it is not yet a system of interlinked bibliographic utilities. More often it is a system of overlapping, duplicative services, available to any library that chooses to pay for access to the databases, especially those of RLIN and OCLC. But development continues in a more integrated fashion than ever before. The sources of the current urge to integrate are diffuse, but a strong motive force can be traced to a group of people, all associated in one way or another with the Council on Library Resources (CLR).

Bibliographic Socialism

As bibliographic records from the nation's libraries were contributed to the National Union Catalog and merged with records from LC, there

developed a view of the bibliographic world that could be described as socialistic. It was theoretically possible for all catalogers to contribute to the bibliographic wealth represented by the NUC and also to enjoy all of the benefits provided by the shared effort represented in that tool. This relatively widespread concept was nurtured and expanded upon by a number of preeminent library scholars. Working together under the auspices of the Council on Library Resources, William Dix (Princeton University), Herman H. Fussler (University of Chicago), Warren J. Haas (Columbia University), Frederick Wagman (University of Michigan), and William Welsh (Library of Congress) prepared a document, "A Review of Some Current Issues and Possible Solutions in the Bibliographical Control of Library Resources," with Fussler as author. The last draft, July 1976, was marked "Confidential" and unfortunately never saw the published light of day. It was circulated among a number of interested individuals and later, just prior to the start of CLR's Bibliographic Service Development Program, was again shared with a limited number of advisors for reaction and comment.

This document defined a bibliographic control environment applicable to the entire nation and, in fact, capable of extension worldwide. Absolutely unconstrained access to bibliographic information by all was the prime objective; it was to be a national system in which overwhelming social benefit argued for federal support and maintenance of the bibliographic structure. The system was to be amenable to evolution, with continuing empirical testing and evaluation as critical components. LC was to assume the leadership role and to create and maintain the national database, develop ways to obtain bibliographic data not available at LC, and exercise responsibility for the quality of the data, regardless of its source. The database would supply machine-readable records to any library requiring them for any purpose. In addition, LC would accept responsibility for production of "general" bibliographic products in a variety of formats.

The bibliographic system was expected to produce improved and more useful products for individual libraries, and especially an improvement in the utility of the library catalog, whatever its current format. However, the total system, the principal bibliographic database, was to include specific location and access paths to desired materials. Hence, library resources would have to become as easily and commonly shared as the bibliographic records representing them.

Part of the national bibliographic system envisaged by the bibliographic socialists was the capability to support institution-specific, computer-based library processing systems, capable of a wide range of functions. It was postulated that existing regional networks could not handle such a processing and service load in the long run.

Finally, the national bibliographic system had to have as a fundamental objective the improvement of services, first to the end user, then to local libraries, and, only as a third priority, to the bibliographic networks—assuming they continued to be necessary or viable. In short, the Fussler document attempted to define what ought to be done in order to bring about maximum bibliographic control and to bring the national bibliographic system into productive and useful existence. Many of the fundamental specifications for this scenario are now matters of fact, though often in slightly altered forms and frequently as the result of efforts initiated by one individual.

Warren J. Haas, ever the synthesizer and creator, assimilated much of this document into his next ten years of effort through a program that came to be called the Bibliographic Service Development Program (BSDP). Key to Haas's efforts to encourage progress on the bibliographic front was his notion of focusing on an ideal situation and comparing any action against progress toward the established goal. Realizing that direct frontal assault on goals within the library community tends to polarize and even politicize the process, the preferred Haas approach is to make modest but consistent gains in directions that, if nothing else, do not lead away from the goal. Characteristic of this process is a continuing reassessment of the goal, to further refine it and to make certain that the goal matches the requirements of the scholarly community. Patient, consistent progress has been the result—progress often attributed to others when, in fact, it has been the firm, steady guidance of Jim Haas and trusted consultants from throughout the world of libraries and scholarship.

Clearly, the key to success of the concepts contained in the original Fussler paper was a strong national library, an entity that exists only partially and in modified form.

National Library Successes and Limitations

The United States is blessed with two special and productive national libraries: the National Library of Medicine (NLM) and the National Agricultural Library (NAL). The Library of Congress, established to support the needs of the Congress and thereby the people of the nation, has never been designated as a national library. It is as though Congress is jealous of its own information resource and does not want to share, and thus dilute, those resources any more than necessary. Despite the lack of an official mandate and clear support to function as a national library, LC has managed to take leadership positions in a number of areas, chief among which has been bibliographic services. Despite this leadership, it is a significant national failure to continue tolerating the denial of sufficient resources and of an official mandate for LC to act as a true national library.

Were LC ever mandated and supported to act as a national library, funds would become available to support certain initiatives defined in the context of national bibliographic and service programs. There are no *national* bibliographic programs in the sense that a well-funded, central agency has defined certain objectives to be in the national interest and therefore worthy of support in order to achieve those objectives. More important, resources to stimulate movement toward established goals and objectives would be made available through a national library. Were LC to be designated a national library, the library support functions within the Department of Education, for instance, might reasonably be subsumed in the mission of LC as a national library.

Some hoped that the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) might be a substitute for a national library focused at LC, a substitute that might then meld the national roles not only of LC but also of NLM and NAL. But NCLIS, with strong information industry and relatively weak library representation, has failed to provide the required leadership toward fundamentally important library operation or service objectives, and certainly has no mandate or resources to create or support operating programs; in general, it has been a toothless tiger during the last several years.

The National Library of Medicine has a long list of successes to its credit, but a significant and unfortunate limitation has been its individuality in the area of bibliographic control issues. Providing early leadership in abstracting and indexing, it was unable to provide the same kind of leadership in other bibliographic areas, though not through any unwillingness to try. These limits are just now being removed as NLM and LC committees meet to resolve incompatibilities between the two bibliographic giants. NLM cannot be faulted entirely, however, because the rest of the library world, including LC, ignored the leadership that was provided by NLM in the early phases of applying computing to library service and operating programs.

The National Agricultural Library, adopting computing technology at a deliberate pace, often assumed an idiosyncratic approach to certain library issues, but to its credit did follow the LC MARC example in bibliographic control. However, the unfortunately low profile of NAL in the bibliographic community is perceived to have been a function of a very narrow definition of its national function, limited to serving the needs of agricultural extension agents. A more egalitarian approach would have strengthened the impact NAL has had on the bibliographic structure of the country and the nature of information services it provides. Enormous strides are now under way at NAL with its *Pork Producers Handbook*, a videodisc-based reference tool, as the flagship of the new NAL image.

Thus, the challenge in creating a national bibliographic program has been to use the massive bibliographic strength of the Library of Congress to goad the library community into the future, while capitalizing on the rather more narrowly focused strengths of NLM and NAL. Coupled with the intense competition among the principal bibliographic utilities, this integrative challenge was made to order for the skills and leadership of Jim Haas.

Bibliographic Options and Alternatives

The Haas Role

It is no accident that, in one way or another, Jim Haas has been involved in nearly every significant bibliographic event in the last twenty or thirty years. Others will note his quiet, good-humored, scholarly approach to literally any problem he has ever faced. Colleagues quickly learn that Haas will forego comment until he has examined all aspects of an issue, evaluated with the precision of an investment banker the existing options, gauged the degree to which a proposed action will encourage progress toward commonly accepted goals, and done a substantial amount of internal and private collegial debating. But once the analytical steps have been completed and the options clearly defined, he formulates and espouses a position with an articulate command of the English language rivaled by few and surpassed by even fewer.

Haas's goals and objectives are developed with an awareness of a multitude of consequences. If there is one characteristic of a Haas concept, it is that it is based on the notion that it must be in the best interests of the scholar—the user of the service or program under review. A corollary to this fundamental guiding principle is that the benefits must justify the costs and the costs should not impede scholarship, particularly costs for access to fundamental resources such as bibliographic data.

Although he has often described himself as a Luddite, Haas has been involved with several of the more significant technical advances made in bibliographic systems. Some of these initiatives include the organization of The Research Libraries Group (covered in Chapter 4) and the selection and modification of the BALLOTS system at Stanford into the Research Libraries Information Network; early support of the Chicago Library Data Management System; the first linkages between certain RLG institutions (e.g., Columbia) and the Library of Congress (using the former New York Public Library system); early support for the Ohio College Library Center, for both organizational studies and support for certain system elements; the COHAYA project, in which the medical libraries of Columbia, Yale, and Harvard universities tried to build a machine-readable database of

bibliographic records, and the development of the MARC standard and the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, Second Edition (AACR2). He has also been involved with landmark programmatic developments such as the technical development plan for a National Periodicals Center; the organization and funding of the Bibliographic Service Development Program; and, more recently, the organization, funding, and launching of the Commission on Preservation and Access and the Mid-Atlantic Preservation Service.

While most of these initiatives occurred while Haas was associated with the Council, either as a Board member or as its president, he developed his convictions, style, and charisma while filling increasingly responsible positions at Johns Hopkins University, Columbia University, and the University of Pennsylvania. It is not clear that these institutions had any direct influence over a developing intellect, but the high visibility of each institution and the roles Haas held in them brought his skills and leadership to the attention of the entire scholarly world.

Haas's tenure at the Council and his reputation as a scrupulously honest man devoted unswervingly to the advancement and improvement of the human condition have brought enormous resources to bear on some nearly intractable problems. The mark of progress is clear on each and every problem he has tackled, but not every seed planted has yet born fruit.

The National Periodicals Center

In the 1970s, Haas became involved in one of the more controversial bibliographic access initiatives of the last century, a project known as the National Periodicals Center (NPC). The concept was based on the British Library's Boston Spa document fulfillment service and the perceived need for such a service in the U.S. Members of the research library community had been discussing for many years how best to put such a service in place. Finally, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science commissioned a preliminary study of the concept. The study suggested that there was some prospect for success in such a program. NCLIS then asked LC to prepare a plan for the center; LC, in turn, asked the Council on Library Resources to undertake the planning effort. Haas, who during this period accepted the presidency of CLR after several years of service on its Board of Directors, was a strong and articulate advocate not only of the NPC but of CLR's participation in the planning process. Consequently, CLR responded to LC's request by raising the resources to support the necessary work and seeing that the document, *A National Periodicals Center: Technical Development Plan*, was developed and distributed in 1978.

The plan called for a centralized repository of periodicals organized for rapid response to requests for individual articles. The bibliographic records

of the collection were to reside in whatever "national" bibliographic database might ultimately be developed. Unfortunately, the plan also called for a board of governors of national stature to establish policy and oversee operations. This one issue polarized members of the library profession in such a way as to preclude any concerted voice on the issue. It is difficult, even in retrospect, to understand completely why this issue became so polarized, except for the all-too-frequent fear within the library profession that one segment or another might be left out of critical policy-setting processes. The information industry, at least as it was represented by the Information Industry Association, was foursquare against the proposal and made its preferences known during meetings of NCLIS and during subsequent congressional hearings.

The death knell for the NPC was sounded during those hearings, which were marked by disagreement among the library profession over what was required in terms of the NPC. The hearing sponsor, Rep. William D. Ford (D-Mich.), finally declared after much confused testimony, "We can't tell where you people (the library profession) stand." The failure of the library community to respond with one voice in support of the NPC was probably the most critical element in the ultimate failure to achieve federal support for the concept. While vague enabling legislation was finally passed, there was never any funding even to begin detailed planning for the center. Because of the enabling legislation, however, there was never a final defeat of the concept, despite the opposition from the Information Industry Association and some publishers, especially small ones.

While the NPC failed to secure federal funding, the notion persists to this day that the concept remains sound. Ten years after the NPC battles were waged, it is not uncommon to hear librarians, library users, even people in the information industry bemoan the lack of such a service. At least two corporations have mounted services they perceive to be NPC equivalents. However, the titles included in these collections are those frequently used and therefore capable of producing enough activity to warrant inclusion in these corporate, for-profit efforts. One of the greatest strengths of the NPC is the wide array of titles that would be made available, regardless of request activity, and would be maintained in perpetuity for the benefit of scholarship. As sound as the concept continues to be, it would not be surprising to discover that Jim Haas is merely biding his time until another appropriate window of opportunity presents itself and another effort will be mounted to achieve the goals set out for the National Periodicals Center.

Another Haas initiative, the Bibliographic Service Development Program, while not universally supported within the library community, has had an enormous and continuing impact on the nature of the bibliographic

record structure of the country and, as noted above, has some of its roots in the Fussler document.

The Bibliographic Service Development Program

The Haas approach to problems facing the nation's academic and research libraries has never been unidirectional. Thus, throughout the planning for and debate over the National Periodicals Center, Haas, as president of CLR, continued to build on the 1976 Fussler document on the nature of the national bibliographic system. A persuasive speaker, capable of providing lucid explanations of library problems to the academic and foundation communities, he proceeded to define a long-term program to help improve the state of bibliographic control and the resulting bibliographic systems available in the U.S. Ultimately, he would raise $5.8 million for the Bibliographic Service Development Program, a CLR venture that would continue for seven years with results felt by virtually every library user in the country.

The BSDP came into existence late in 1978 at a time when the bibliographic world was marked by a number of uncoordinated, even disjointed, efforts to build bibliographic control systems. Some examples include the University of Chicago's Library Data Management System (1970); the Ohio College Library Center, or OCLC (1967); Stanford University's BALLOTS system (1974), ultimately taken over by The Research Libraries Group and renamed RLIN; the Washington State Library's system, the Washington Library Network (WLN), developed by Boeing and based on the Chicago system; the University of Toronto Library Automated System, or UTLAS (1972); the New York Public Library system, abandoned in favor of the RLIN system; and at least a dozen others. Each one of these developments was made possible by the Library of Congress's MARC tape subscription service.

Ironically, one of LC's most lucrative services, the card distribution service, was doomed by the MARC subscription service. For years LC had produced millions of catalog cards for both sale and subscription to libraries all over the world. Income from this service became so substantial that Congress began requiring LC to return a fixed sum each year to the U.S. Treasury. When the developing bibliographic services, particularly OCLC, began offering services to libraries, they also offered one-stop shopping. A subscriber could get not only shared cataloging services, but also catalog card sets, sorted and ready to file into the catalog. It was not long before the LC card service was severely compromised in terms of cost recovery, despite some very aggressive system upgrades designed to reduce further the costs of supplying cards to libraries. It became clear that the future was wrapped up not in catalog cards, but in bibliographic services that

would soon lead to online catalogs. CLR would provide an important catalytic role in this transition.

The Council's Bibliographic Service Development Program came into existence with three goals for a nationwide bibliographic program:

1. To provide effective bibliographic services for all who need them;
2. To improve the nature and quality of bibliographic products; and
3. To stabilize the costs of many bibliographic processes in individual libraries.

The state of the bibliographic environment when the BSDP came into existence was characterized by intense competition among three bibliographic "utilities" for customer/members. The Washington Library Network was the least contentious, having carved out a regional audience that was not overly attractive to the other utilities. The Research Libraries Group needed to grow dramatically in order to spread its not inconsiderable growth and operational costs across a significant number of large research institutions. Having begun after OCLC was well established, RLG found that some large research libraries already committed to OCLC were adamantly opposed to what they perceived to be a dilution of OCLC. Some OCLC research library directors even believed that their credibility within the home institution would suffer if they chose to move to RLG, regardless of whether any benefits might accrue from such a move. The atmosphere was tense, even bitter at times, between RLG and OCLC institutions, a circumstance that would improve slowly over the next several years. The BSDP's entry onto the stage during the height of contention between the two organizations provided a nonthreatening, impartial environment in which the two principal contenders could establish some level of communication.

In order, among other objectives, to encourage and foster this communication, the BSDP formed a program committee composed of the chief executive officers of RLG, OCLC, and WLN; the chief LC manager responsible for bibliographic services (Henriette Avram); a senior research university cataloging manager (Carol Ishimoto, Harvard University); a senior research university public services manager (Joan Gotwals, University of Pennsylvania, who joined the committee in its second year); and a research university librarian (James Govan, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill). For the first meeting or two, there was also a representative of the Chicago Library Data Management System. The program committee met four times a year to discuss initiatives that might productively be undertaken by the BSDP in order to make progress toward the goals of the program. Early discussions were as much opportunities for discovery among the chief bibliographic protagonists as discussions of policy. The

lack of understanding between the various bibliographic utilities was startling, but as time passed the misunderstandings were much reduced. Opportunities to promote cooperative action were explored from the very first program committee meetings, but the first cooperative project, an exploration of online catalogs, would not begin for almost two years.

While the general perception of the BSDP as a disinterested environment in which RLG and OCLC could discuss issues was relatively widespread, many people, including the first OCLC chief executive officer, believed that Haas's role in getting The Research Libraries Group off the ground automatically meant that the BSDP would be a pro-RLG program. Despite enormous efforts on the part of Haas and his CLR staff to disavow such a bias, it persisted to the end of the program. Further, the emphasis on academic and research library problems was further perceived to be evidence of a pro-RLG stance on the part of the Council. OCLC, attempting to serve the bibliographic needs of all kinds of libraries and under pressure from many quarters to provide often conflicting services, found the CLR/BSDP focus on academic and research libraries limiting. However, the often-expressed view of Jim Haas was that the limited resources of the Council had to be employed where they could be expected to have maximum impact. He believed, along with many others, that programs that yielded solid benefits for complicated organizations like research libraries would provide long-term benefits for all libraries. In fact, at least two of the major programs of the BSDP would prove that contention to be so: (1) the efforts to link bibliographic service systems and (2) the development and assessment of online public access catalogs.

The documentation prepared by CLR, principally by Jim Haas, to secure funding for the BSDP program attempted to identify the areas in which productive activity would be useful. The roots of these initiatives are deep but can be identified easily in the Fussler paper noted above. However, once the program committee began its deliberations, it became clear that despite the array of areas in which the program was expected to be active, there were a limited number in which it could have substantial impact. Clearly, all program committee members viewed standards and the improvement of the basic bibliographic database as fruitful areas for action.

Areas that received less consolidated support and guidance from the program committee included efforts to link the bibliographic utilities and the improvement of bibliographic products and services. The BSDP commissioned Battelle Laboratories to examine the options available for linking bibliographic databases. The entire concept of linking began as a divisive, angry set of discussions. In fact, when the first halting steps were taken to begin exploration of how useful links might be forged among the largest bibliographic systems (LC, OCLC, RLG, and WLN), OCLC decided such a move would not be in its long-term interest and opted not to

participate. RLG and WLN prepared a memorandum of agreement in which they pledged themselves to find a way to cooperate and share bibliographic records and system development. Within months, OCLC requested and was granted the opportunity to observe what was going on in the project. The first link participants, RLG and WLN, were joined belatedly by LC in defining what the links should do and how they should operate. As the project got deeper into telecommunication protocols and the selection of various options within chosen protocols that would be amenable in any future link environment, the participants sought and received the help of OCLC's telecommunications group. Finally, when the link path had been fairly well identified and it was clear that the distribution of MARC authority and bibliographic records from LC would use this link, OCLC became a full partner in the specification of the link and software to implement the selected protocols. As the project grew, demanding substantial software work at each participating site, the least well-supported participant, WLN, fell behind and has not yet caught up.

A much less controversial project supported through the BSDP was the strengthening of the Library of Congress name authority file, the file that records all LC-accepted versions of names, both personal and corporate. The first large grant made through the BSDP was to assist LC in converting one hundred thousand name authority records to machine-readable form and thus to strengthen the LC name authority file. This project took almost eighteen months to complete and provided one of the nonpolitical topics about which the program committee could talk. The agenda of each meeting was crafted in such a way that non- or apolitical items were provided as discussion buffers between the tough issues that were likely to create tension. As the authority file grew larger, LC was able to begin to consider ways for other qualified research libraries to contribute authority records to the file. The early contributions were all in paper form and were completely validated by LC staff. It became obvious that a more efficient way of contributing authority records had to be found. With the progress being made in the project to establish a link between the major bibliographic systems, it was agreed that an exchange of authority records should be the first implementation of the operating link.

By 1986, LC was sending updates to the name authority file over the link to the RLIN system. Within another year, the first authority records contributed by RLG institutions began to flow back to LC. OCLC began receiving records some months later, but, in the throes of designing and implementing a new operating system, has had to wait until its Oxford system is implemented before being able to contribute authority records to the LC file.

LC was also encouraged, not only by the BDSP but by many other institutions, to design ways to use the link for bibliographic records as

well as authority records. The result is the National Coordinated Cataloging Program (NCCP), in which selected libraries contribute national-level bibliographic records to the LC database for subsequent redistribution over the link as part of the MARC tape subscription service. The non-threatening efforts to enhance the LC name authority file and to build both that file and the LC bibliographic database with contributions from other libraries provided much of the justification for the Linked Systems Project (LSP), as the effort to design and implement linkages between the four largest bibliographic databases came to be known.

Standards related to bibliographic records, cataloging systems (AACR2), and telecommunication protocols all received attention from the BSDP and its program committee. Enthusiastic support for nearly any initiative to strengthen and encourage the adoption of standards in these areas was the rule. Indeed, nearly any standards initiative espoused by the BSDP could count on substantial support from each of the utilities and the Library of Congress. Given the importance of the standards supported by BSDP (serial holdings detail, AACR2 options, telecommunication protocols, a manuscript coding system, etc.), a strong case could be made that the presence of these standards justified the entire BSDP investment. However, BSDP accomplishments were not so limited.

The second goal of the BSDP, "to improve the quality of bibliographic products," led to the support of two important projects that grew into significant bibliographic products. The first was a project to develop a piece of microcomputer software capable of claiming bibliographic records from a number of sources and organizing them into a private database. In addition, the system has the capability to create bibliographies of cited materials in a number of user-defined formats. The Personal Bibliographic System, now marketed for a variety of personal computers, is a market success. It is also one of the BSDP projects that Jim Haas probably views with the least satisfaction, primarily because of the high market price now charged for the product, which was developed substantially with funds from the not-for-profit community. At the time the funds were sought, it was understood that the product would be made available to the scholarly community at modest cost (CLR staff thought the price would approximate the cost of making a duplicate disk) as a useful personal bibliographic tool. Hence, no agreement was made to recover the CLR-invested funds should the product become a market success. It is not known how many copies have been sold, but a separate company (Personal Bibliographic Software, Inc.) finally was established to continue development of the software and to market it.

The online catalog projects represented the most significant contribution made to the improvement of bibliographic products, improvements that are now felt by every user of a modern online public catalog. The set of

projects began with a "patented" CLR approach to a problem—a multi-day meeting in isolation with no distractions other than the topic at hand. The setting was idyllic—a Dartmouth College conference center, beside the lake upon which *On Golden Pond* was filmed. The meeting site proved so idyllic that two participants, previously unknown to one another, were married some months later. Aside from such unexpected social events and, after considering the current state of online catalogs, the group agreed unanimously that not enough was known about how people used these tools and about what was required of a truly effective online catalog. By the time the meeting was over, it was clear that CLR and the BSDP would soon have an agenda to pursue with respect to online catalogs.

The actual arrangement for the online catalog meeting, its agenda, and its summary were planned cooperatively by personnel from RLG and OCLC in one of the first publicly acknowledged instances of interutility cooperation. During the summarizing process, it became apparent that OCLC and RLG needed more information about online catalogs and that they, along with others, might productively evaluate those that were already in operation with an eye toward influencing the nature of subsequent catalogs. In the end, both utilities, the University of California MELVYL system staff, and J. Matthews & Associates each sought and received CLR/BSDP support for a coordinated assessment of online catalogs. The year-long project resulted in an examination of thirty-six different catalogs, with conclusions recorded in at least two monographs, more than a dozen papers, and probably three dozen formal public presentations.

A number of small projects related to online catalogs received support over the next two years. Finally, in 1985, a follow-up conference was held at the Lakeway Conference Center on Lake Travis, just outside of Austin, Texas. During the course of the first day, more than twenty different online catalogs were demonstrated and assessed by independent evaluators. It was clear that much progress had been made in the intervening three or four years. Nearly every system had become easier to use (more user friendly); one system from the University of Georgia even demonstrated an early use of color to highlight certain kinds of information in a display. Still, there was much to be done. Some called for a standardized set of commands so that users of more than one system would at least be familiar with the basics when moving between systems. However, others argued that the field was still too new to be confined by standard commands. The best that could be hoped for was a core set of commands, and work continues on this aspect of online catalogs.

The more critical online catalog problem, that of different sets of indexes from one catalog to another, remains a critical and apparently intractable problem. Two catalogs with identical holdings but indexed differently by

different online catalog software can produce different results from the same query. While this problem is discouraging to observers, the fact is that not many users yet have access to more than one catalog at a time. If progress continues at the pace of the mid- to late 1980s in developing and refining online catalogs, the indexing and command language problems may be resolved or dramatically ameliorated within the next five years.

In summary, the progress stimulated or encouraged by Jim Haas, the Council, and the BSDP includes a much-strengthened LC name authority file, significant standards appropriate for the cataloging and bibliographic communities, aggressive progress in the Linked Systems Project moving toward effective links between the major bibliographic databases of the country, and much-improved online catalogs, now spreading like wildfire throughout the library community—academic, research, special, public, even school libraries, large and small. It is truly a stunning tribute to a man who describes himself self-effacingly as a Luddite with a strong preference for the quill pen over the computer!

An Assessment of Results

At what point is it fair to review events and evaluate their impact or worth? Five years? Ten years? Historians often engage in debates over just such issues for decades themselves. This author, having played roles both in the development of the technical plan for a National Periodicals Center and in the Bibliographic Service Development Program, is not the one to do the assessment. However, certain facts can be noted about each of these initiatives, and comments made on the role Haas played in each.

Access to Periodicals

Nearly ten years after the design of a National Periodicals Center began, there still is not a credible version of such a facility. There is a commercial enterprise, University Microfilms, Inc. (UMI), which has mounted the nearest thing to a responsive source for journal articles. However, the inventory of available titles is limited by both the number of titles and the number of years for which any given title is available. No concerted effort is made to assure that valuable foreign language titles are maintained regardless of current demand. A basic inconsistency between corporate efforts to provide access to periodical or any other format of information and the needs of research and scholarship is the nearly limitless range of little-known and little-used materials from obscure sources. A fundamental role of research libraries has been to accumulate and manage such information and make it available as required. The corporate world has not been able to support the maintenance of infrequently used materials—

hence the concentration of services like UMI's on the heavily used titles. So, while UMI represents a source for the "popular" periodical titles, the research library community is forced to continue independently to maintain large collections of materials for their possible research value.

The OCLC interlibrary loan system has tended to spread the demand over many more libraries, but the fact remains that there is no central repository for periodical materials being built or maintained in this country. It is ironic that the number of requests made by U.S. research libraries to the British Library's Boston Spa operation continues to rise, despite the high costs of both communicating the request and sending the materials.

The improvement of a number of computerized bibliographic databases linked to interlibrary loan subsystems or modules has managed to stay ahead of the continually rising demand for interlibrary loan materials, especially periodicals. However, one of the prime reasons for considering the NPC in the first place was to relieve the burden on extant collections—a burden that was perceived to be wearing out collections at an alarming rate. Now that the wear has been spread over more collections by virtue of the improved ILL systems, the pressure for an NPC-like collection has eased. However, it will be surprising if we do not see another effort to put an NPC in place before the end of the century.

Haas's role in the NPC was far more than simply manager of the group that put together the technical development plan. His life-long preoccupation with effective administration of large research libraries led him to believe that an organization such as NPC could provide options for all libraries. The knowledge that a carefully crafted collection of periodicals would be maintained for rapid access in perpetuity would allow libraries to design their own internal acquisition, preservation, and retention policies in very different ways. Some titles might not have to be acquired at all, especially rarely used foreign language titles. Some would be acquired but not retained beyond a fixed period of time, possibly requiring no preservation action or cost at all. In short, the NPC from the Haas perspective would have given libraries an opportunity to achieve even better control over their limited resources and would have allowed them to redeploy some of those resources in order to enhance service to the scholarly community—all with no noticeable degradation in service or access to information. While the current lack of an NPC is certainly a failure to provide the options for library management that Haas dreamed of, the failure to defeat the plan convincingly is a tribute to the soundness of the thinking behind it.

Access to Bibliographic Information

Assessing the impact of the Bibliographic Service Development Program is even more difficult since some of the initiatives of that program are just beginning to bear fruit. The most difficult question is what specific role the BSDP played in the bibliographic developments during its tenure and beyond. Certainly it was not the only factor influencing what transpired, but is was one of the only independent, impartial factors.

As noted above, Haas's role in the BSDP grew out of a long commitment to service to scholarship and a belief that advances in bibliographic services for research libraries would have a beneficial impact on all libraries, a concept that continues to seem valid despite some noted opposition. Sanford Berman might argue that the rigor (maybe even rigor mortis) of the LC-research library subject heading environment is not useful at all for smaller libraries. However, accommodating specialized subject approaches continues to be a goal of the developing bibliographic structure of the country. Haas's view, not widely recognized, is that this sort of flexibility is fundamental to a bibliographic system that must serve the needs of the mathematician, the music scholar, the social scientist, the historian, the applied scientist, and all the other components of the research university community. A bibliographic system that can serve this community, a reflection of society at large, is likely to be capable of serving the needs of that society.

As of mid-1988, it can be observed that, no matter what the specific contribution of the BSDP, the bibliographic structure of the country is much improved over that of 1978. Selected libraries have joined with the Library of Congress to build the name authority file used by every major bibliographic system in the country. This cooperation now extends to the building of LC's bibliographic database, with cataloging being contributed by external institutions and redistributed via the MARC subscription service and the LSP links between LC, RLG, and OCLC. In short, the notion of the bibliographic socialists is coming closer to reality.

In the area of bibliographic products, the online catalog is the single most pervasive innovation in libraries of all sizes and types. The BSDP is not responsible for the existence of these powerful bibliographic tools, but it is unlikely that any of them have escaped the influence of BSDP-supported evaluations and design analyses. The amount of attention focused on the manner in which a library user interacts with the computer screen and keyboard (the user/system interface, to use the jargon) has led to a variety of ever-easier ways to use these systems. There are still some nearly intractable problems, but to the user of a single online catalog, they tend not to be obvious. So pervasive have been the effects of BSDP-supported efforts to improve online catalogs that bibliographies of works

related to the online catalog are full of papers and monographs that were completely or partially funded by the BSDP or other Council-supported programs.

The work focused on linking large bibliographic systems also received substantial impetus and support from the BSDP. It is unfortunate that a recent monograph purporting to document the Linked Systems Project fails to recognize the very significant impact of the BSDP on progress made to date. Without CLR support, the linking of the current bibliographic utilities and the Library of Congress may never have gotten off the ground. That support was used to specify the requirements of the link, the protocols to be used, and their specific implementation in RLIN, WLN, OCLC, and LC's internal operating system. Authority and bibliographic records are being exchanged between LC, RLG, and OCLC over LSP links.

At least as significant as the linking of the utilities is the prospect for linking local systems to the utilities and to one another. New York University and its Geac system contractor have established a linkage to the RLIN database. Individual commercial vendors of online systems increasingly are being required to commit to linkages with other systems using protocols accepted by the standards community. Most of those are the linkages espoused by the Linked Systems Project. While there is still much work to be done, prospects are good that a totally revamped bibliographic structure will come into existence in the U.S., and it is equally likely that a substantial number of these developments have the Council's BSDP as part of their roots.

Pervasive Nationwide Bibliographic Services

Once the linkages are in place, the system for allowing communication from one local system to literally any other local or utility system in the nationwide set of linkages will be possible. It will be similar to the first years of the interstate highway system in the western states—huge open highways connecting distant points but with very little traffic on them. Clearly, collections of institutions sharing services among several online catalogs and one or more utilities will generate more traffic than disparate systems with no elements in common. But once the linkages are available (the highways built and opened for service), those with access to the network will begin to explore ways to use the links to their benefit and the benefit of the scholarly communities they serve. One of Haas's notions, that of providing access to scholars as they demand and require it, will become ever more real as the potentials for using the network linkages are explored.

The heritage that the Haas era will leave behind—and he is far from completing his service to the academic and scholarly world—will be one of new sets of options for the management of all libraries; expanded and expansive sets of bibliographic databases capable of serving the needs of a wide array of populations; and powerful information access systems capable of retrieving not only specific monograph and article citation information but text materials as well. Much of this improved array of resources and bibliographic tools will be based upon powerful telecommunication linkages among virtually all systems that choose to be part of the nationwide (rather than national) bibliographic structure—the structure envisioned and continually redefined by Warren J. Haas and his bibliographic socialist friends and colleagues.

References

Fussler, Herman. "A Review of Some Current Issues and Possible Solutions in the Bibliographical Control of Library Resources." Council on Library Resources (unpublished), 1976.

Gwinn, Nancy E., Warren J. Haas, and C. Lee Jones. "Managing the Information Revolution: CLR's Bibliographic Service Development Program." *Library Journal* 104, no. 16 (September 15, 1979): 1867-70.

Haas, Warren J. "Computing in Documentation and Scholarly Research." *Science* 215 (February 12, 1982): 857-61.

———. "Organizational Structures to Meet Future Bibliographic Requirements." *Library Quarterly* 47, no. 3 (1977): 274-84.

Jones, C. Lee. "Academic Libraries and Computing: A Time of Change." *EDUCOM Bulletin* 20, no. 1 (Spring 1985): 9-12.

———. "A National Bibliographic Network: Dream or Reality." Unpublished manuscript delivered as the 15th Esther L. Stallman Lecture, The University of Texas Graduate School of Library and Information Science, February 25, 1986.

———. "The Politics of Consensus." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 7, no. 2 (July 1981): 156-60.

———. "Trends and Developments in North American Libraries." In *New Information Technologies and Libraries*, edited by H. Liebaers, W. J. Haas, and W. E. Biervliet, 177-85. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1985.

A National Periodicals Center: Technical Development Plan. Washington, D.C.: Council on Library Resources, 1978.

CHAPTER 4

RLG Revisited

Rutherford D. Rogers

This paper undertakes to reexamine the early years of The Research Libraries Group (RLG) with particular reference to the period from 1972 to 1978. It also contains some modest, very personal reflections on events and actions. The paper can hardly pose as an adequate history; it is too selective in the topics and period covered and in the sources reviewed. Several matters are recorded here that have not previously been published. In fact, a few of them are not documented except in the frail memory of one of the "founders."

By now, the identity of the founders is well established: Douglas Bryant of Harvard University, Richard Couper of the New York Public Library (NYPL), Warren J. Haas of Columbia University, and Rutherford D. Rogers of Yale University. What has not been established is how it all began. I believe it was at an Association of Research Libraries (ARL) program meeting in early 1972 that Bryant, Haas, and Rogers were sitting together; the topic being presented concerned the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC—now the Online Computer Library Center). Some statement caused a light to go on in at least two and perhaps three heads simultaneously: the research libraries needed a cooperative mechanism that was shaped to the very special needs of such libraries. The nature of the thinking—greatly expanded in detail—was undoubtedly expressed in a memorandum of July 19, 1972, of uncertain authorship. (One of the exasperating facts about attempting to reconstruct events from the existing files is that memos are occasionally undated and often unsigned, thus leading to some speculation as to times and authorship.) The memo of July 19, 1972, proposes the establishment of

---

Rutherford D. Rogers is a former Yale University Librarian.

> . . . a major computer based system for the purpose of creating a shared data base of bibliographic records . . . as a fundamental step toward a broad range of activities including more efficiently produced records, a more rationalized system of collection building, and a greater sharing of resources. . . . The libraries participating in OCLC are predominantly college libraries, with . . . relatively homogenous collections emphasizing English language publications. . . . The Columbia, Harvard and Yale University Libraries and the New York Public Library acquire a far larger spectrum of titles in an infinitely greater diversity of languages and with far more difficult problems of bibliographical entry stemming from the unusual nature of many of the publications acquired . . . and sharing of common bibliographical data among large libraries will greatly facilitate their processing activities. . . . During the development and early implementation stages it is essential to limit participation to the four institutions. Eventually additional institutions should become involved—some as full participants, others through ability to access the data base.

This wording reflected greater perspicacity with respect to eventual developments than was realized. The memo made reference to " . . . a firm commitment to uniformity of cataloguing principles, as well as uncompromising quality of cataloger performance, features not necessarily present in other networks."

Although the July 19, 1972, memo did not allude to overall management control of the consortium by its users, it is the recollection of the writer that this was a major consideration. The memo did stress the geographic proximity of the four institutions, the importance of establishing a corporation to assure continuity of the endeavors, and the desirability of having a panel of advisers with representation from the Library of Congress and other research libraries. It was estimated that a central staff of twenty to twenty-five persons (!) would be needed at the peak—a very early, almost fatal miscalculation—and it was proposed to enter into a six- to twelve-month planning period.

A memo written earlier than the one just cited sheds additional light on the thinking in the first days of the founders. This earlier memo, identified as a third draft, dated March 15, 1972, and bearing the initials RDR, referred only to Columbia, Harvard, and Yale as prospective initiators of the consortium. Even at this early stage, however, the New York Public Library was a prospective fourth participant, as is evidenced by a marginal note in the hand of Donald B. Engley, Yale's associate university librarian: "and NYPL?" The addition of the New York Public Library between March and July of 1972 came as a result of two strong considerations: the close, existing cooperative arrangements between Columbia

and NYPL and the great strength of NYPL collections, although NYPL's historical prohibition against circulating books from the research collections posed a problem. However, President Couper believed this problem was soluble, and in fact it proved to be. This March 1972 memo laid out operating goals that became remarkably prophetic. Among them were:

1. Reciprocal access to member collections, short of borrowing privileges, by faculty and graduate students.
2. Cooperative collection development in such areas as:
   a. amalgamation of discontinued serial runs;
   b. new serials and expensive microtext series;
   c. reexamination of the necessity for duplication of serial titles within the consortium to determine if a single subscription would meet collective demands; and
   d. identification of libraries of primary collecting responsibility in certain geographic, linguistic, and subject areas.
3. The memo does not make reference to the preservation problem, but it was certainly a matter of grave concern to the founders. (See reference to the Haas memo of April 1974, cited below.) Everyone accepted the natural linkage between centers of collecting strength and preservation responsibility. Furthermore, NYPL had been a pioneer since the days of H. M. Lydenberg (during the twenties and thirties) in preservation; Keyes D. Metcalf, who went from the position of Chief of the Reference Department of NYPL to head Harvard's libraries, had established an active newspaper microfilming program in Cambridge. Yale had created a Preservation Office in 1971, and Columbia had a long-established reputation in photocopying. The training of preservation specialists and the exchange of information on titles preserved or to be preserved was increasingly on the minds of research librarians.
4. It was believed that a common database of bibliographic records would make it possible to speed the processing of interlibrary loan requests.

Finally, the memo of March 1972 referred to acronyms for the consortium: HALCYON (Harvard, Columbia, Yale, etc.) was under consideration as late as June 13, 1973. A memo dated August 2, 1973, by Donald B. Engley of Yale, stated: "One other piece of business on Monday was the burial of the acronym HALCYON due to the strong objections of one of the member libraries. For the time being, at least, we are operating as the Research Libraries Group."

The period from July 1972 to July 1973 was marked by intense planning and consultation of member task forces that explored bibliographic co-

ordination, technical hardware problems, collaborative collection development, and potential governance problems of a consortium with an enlarged membership, a substantial central staff, and a heavy investment in hardware. One of the anticipated problems proved smaller than anticipated—namely, staff support within member libraries. This writer had been a pioneer in the regional public library movement in New York State in the late forties and early fifties and had learned how indispensable staff support and cooperation were to a new venture. Furthermore, just the general idea of automation had long raised the specter of loss of jobs, especially among technical services personnel. The enthusiasm with which the staffs of the founding libraries proceeded was heartening and went a long way toward assuring the initial success of RLG. It did take time, however, for the staffs to think of RLG not as a separate, somewhat alien effort, but rather as an integral part of the fabric of each institution.

The Council on Library Resources (CLR) was helpful in providing one of its staff members for the purpose of visiting the four founding institutions and exploring potential areas that required early attention. The desirability of an outside consultant to do a formal planning study became evident to the founders and was endorsed by CLR.

Joseph A. Rosenthal, Librarian at the University of California, Berkeley, whose early experience had been heavily in the technical services field, was engaged as the ideal candidate to undertake a planning study between July 5 and October 15, 1973. His report, issued in December 1973, recommended, among other things:

1. A board of directors, with each founding library represented.
2. A bibliographic center
   a. to establish whether an item was held;
   b. to emphasize access to, rather than ownership of, publications;
   c. to serve as a communications link to facilitate rapid communication; and
   d. to facilitate interlending.
3. Shared collection development emphasizing selection of serials and, in the long term, possibly to allocate acquisition responsibility.
4. Standardized cataloging practices based on Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, LC subject headings, and LC classification. Harvard and NYPL still had unique classification systems and Yale had only recently switched from such a system to LC notation.
5. The possibility of producing a microform catalog of member holdings, looking to an eventual online catalog.

At an April 30, 1974, meeting at Yale, it was reported that legal counsels of the four institutions had met to work on a proper legal underpinning for the consortium. At this same April 30 meeting it was proposed that RLG should support, as a matter of principle, an interlibrary loan fee system pegged initially at fifty percent of cost of a loan to the lending library. This was a fundamental principle because the founding institutions had many decades of experience in the mounting burdens of interlibrary lending. On June 4, 1974, a "Program Statement for a Consortium of Research Libraries: Yale, New York Public Library, Harvard, Columbia" proposed that the members should "share the cost of operating the proposed joint system in a manner commensurate with the benefits received. This will include some clearing house arrangement to compensate any library that provides substantially more service than it receives." The failure fully to put into practice this principle was to become a long-standing source of friction within RLG. It is interesting to note that as of 1987 this principle had yet to be firmly established, although recognition was finally being accorded it, as reported in the November 1987 RLG *Operations Update*.

It may be worth pointing out that the direct cost of an interlibrary loan is only one-quarter to one-third of the cost of adding an average publication to the shelves of a library (quite apart from housing and preserving a publication, sometimes for decades or centuries). It seemed to the founders that it was privilege enough to be a member of a consortium that would give priority access to such publications, sparing the borrowing institution acquisition, preservation, and housing costs while only requiring a sharing of direct lending costs.

The April 30, 1974, meeting recognized, not surprisingly, that funding the consortium was likely to be a major problem. Also at this meeting, the Serials Task Force reported having met five times "to formulate methodology for coordinating serials subscriptions within RLG, considering both new titles and titles already held." It was proposed that special attention might be given to keeping track of master sets of serials with a high annual cost in the minimum range of two hundred to five hundred dollars.

At the May 1974 meeting of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) this writer, on behalf of the founders, made a report to the Association, emphasizing the following points.

1. The directors were meeting approximately biweekly.
2. A director of the bibliographic center was being sought. The center was to be an ideal place for verification of citations and location of items wanted on interloan.

3. Communication by TWX or unlimited voice hook-ups was being explored.
4. A series of task forces was working on standardization and collection development, with particular reference to cooperative efforts in serials and identification of major collecting responsibilities.

The report to the Association also took note of criticisms that had been expressed by the American Booksellers Association with respect to the deleterious effects such collaborative collection building and interlibrary lending would have on publishers. This part of the report to ARL stated:

> You may have seen the reaction of publishers and booksellers to RLG. The comments are uninformed and suspiciously timely in bringing pressure on the Congress as it once again tries to move ahead on copyright legislation. There is nothing in our program that prohibits any member from acquiring any publication it considers essential. Secondly, we do not see an absolute drop in acquisitions expenditures but rather a leveling of the intolerable curve that . . . cannot be sustained at 1950-70 rates. . . . These factors will operate within the RLG context not in the purchase of fewer publications . . . but rather in a more organized expenditure that will permit copies in any one institution where demand dictates such duplication and, at the same time, an assurance that lesser-used publications will be available to the extent that combined expenditures can be wisely deployed. And since we are major supporters of the Center for Research Libraries we are not overlooking its resources as an integral part of our plans and operations.

There had also been allegations by other research librarians that RLG was elitist and was being developed without broad consultation. To this the response was:

> Finally, we wish to reiterate our strong desire to open our enterprise to membership of other libraries at an appropriate time. We speculated at the outset—and I speak of the time before even the four members were decided upon—that there would be plenty of problems to iron out with only three or four participants. I only hope that all of our prognostications might be equally accurate because the array of knotty issues has surpassed even our nightmares, and we are certain at this stage that were we dealing with the peculiarities of even a single additional institution the prospects of developing a viable enterprise might seem beyond reach.

It was clear from the early stages of RLG that supplemental funding would be needed from outside sources to launch the consortium. A seminal document for use in fund raising was drafted by Haas of Columbia in April 1974. A later, somewhat condensed version was prepared in October 1974. It laid out a plan for RLG "as an alternative to the heretofore dominant philosophy of institutional self-sufficiency." Stress was laid on declining library budgets, the decreased purchasing power of the dollar in overseas markets, and the increase in the cost of publications, which for over ten years had exceeded the cost of living. The decline in federal grant funds was also noted. The memo went on to emphasize the avoidance of unnecessary duplication and the importance of rapid document delivery and document preservation.

On the subject of the application of computer technology to bibliographic control, the memo expressed RLG's intention to explore existing systems at Stanford University, the University of Chicago, Columbia, the New York Public Library, and OCLC. "It is anticipated that an RLG system can be constructed by selecting and adapting existing software programs." At the very least this proved to be an overly optimistic simplification.

> Implicit in RLG thinking and planning is a sense of responsibility for participating in national programs to preserve resources, to share access to collections and to develop systems of bibliographic control. RLG is committed to using accepted standards for computer-based bibliographic information so that these very large collections might make an effective contribution to national systems for bibliographic control, as well as facilitating communication within RLG. Of equal importance is RLG's intention to invite other libraries to participate in its programs at appropriate times in the future. . . . The nature of these four large libraries . . . requires a federation of institutions rather than the delegation of authority to an independent organization.
>
> It is recognized that as soon as possible RLG programs must become sufficiently cost-effective to justify the support of operating expenses by member institutions. By quickly developing these programs, additional libraries can be brought into membership to share the benefits and contribute to the costs of RLG operations."

At this point, the original four members estimated that over a three-year period they would be contributing $120,000 toward program costs plus $1,200,000 in staff time.

> It is recognized that trade books and basic titles must be acquired by all research libraries; however, there are many languages, such as

> Hungarian, Modern Greek, Baltic and Dutch, in which all libraries need not collect comprehensively so long as one institution accepts responsibility and provides access . . . . Domestic and foreign newspapers, foreign official gazettes, expensive microform projects, specialized information services, college catalogues, textbooks and similar groups of material are needed by scholars, but duplication in each library is not necessary so long as there is a system to assure access.

During this period, Bryant, Couper, and Haas were all active in fund raising. Couper had been instrumental in securing a $15,000 grant from the Skerryvore Foundation to support the Rosenthal study and report. The 1974 *RLG* efforts produced a $750,000 Andrew W. Mellon Foundation grant in June. At the end of the year, a $350,000 grant was forthcoming from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, followed in 1975 by a similar grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

These early fund-raising efforts are listed to illustrate that the founders had sufficient confidence by mid-1974 to support the employment of a full-time director of the new enterprise. James Skipper was offered the position, effective August 1, 1974, and he was introduced at a meeting of representatives of the four institutions on September 4, 1974.

Between September 26 and October 10, 1974, representatives of the four institutions signed an agreement relating to the formal establishment of *RLG*. Incorporation as a nonprofit corporation was anticipated, and each institution undertook to contribute $10,000 during each of the first three years.

The three years from 1975 to 1978 were characterized by intense organizational development and fund raising. *RLG* was formally incorporated on December 19, 1975. During 1976, the National Endowment for the Humanities made a $250,000 challenge grant to the consortium and, on December 22, 1976, the executive committee accepted a $750,000 gift from Timothy Mellon for the acquisition of computers and related equipment. In October of 1976 the executive committee considered the possibility of admitting additional members but decided to delay such action. The choice of a bibliographic processing system had yet to be determined and required intensive investigation. In fact, it was not until March 9, 1978, that the executive committee reached the final stage of analyzing proposals from Stanford, Chicago, OCLC, and the New York Public Library to serve as *RLG*'s automated bibliographic processing system. Columbia and Yale favored the Stanford system, while NYPL urged adoption of its own system and Harvard favored OCLC. On March 14, the *RLG* board of directors informed Stanford that the board intended to adopt the Stanford system. Ten days later, President Bok of Harvard announced its intention of withdrawing from *RLG*. The reasons given by

Harvard were principally (1) that continued participation by Harvard was not in its or *RLG*'s interest and (2) complexities within Harvard's own system of libraries made Harvard's participation difficult.

The choice of an automated bibliographic system and Harvard's withdrawal from *RLG* marked the end of the major effort to create *RLG*. The initial five years represent approximately a third of *RLG*'s history as of the time this article was written. With the wisdom of hindsight one might make certain observations:

1. The initial concept of the nature, activities, and special areas of concentration of *RLG* proved to be remarkably prophetic. Not fully anticipated, but nonetheless welcomed, was the formation of special subject and language groups to pursue distinctive interests and problems in such areas as art, law, medicine, music, divinity, East Asia, and archives and manuscripts. Success in handling non-Roman alphabets—particularly Cyrillic, Hebrew, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean—were, perhaps, faintly hoped for, but eventual achievements were spectacular.

2. Interinstitutional staff cooperation was extremely productive and remarkably harmonious.

3. The size of the staff (presently approximately ninety) and the complexity and cost of the central operation were woefully underestimated.

4. The magnitude of overall activity and financial difficulties were likewise underestimated and were almost endlessly a source of grave concern.

5. Like the size of the central staff, the telecommunications costs of operating nationally and eventually internationally with a single central database were not sufficiently anticipated and eventually required devising new approaches to basic networking concepts.

6. Foundation support was indispensable and remarkably good. If one foundation were to be singled out for special praise, it would be the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, with extraordinary gratitude to its president, Jack Sawyer, during much of *RLG*'s first fifteen years. On the other hand, the loans negotiated from Ford and Carnegie presented exceptional problems before they were finally settled.

7. Changing leadership needs, illness, and personal preferences conspired to dictate that RLG would be seeking its fifth chief executive officer at the end of fifteen years. The talent needed to lead a highly technical central staff, to maintain liaison with thirty-six full member institutions (not just at the library director level but frequently with presidents and provosts), to serve as spokesman in national and international forums, and successfully to attract new members—all of these skills were hard to find when people with such talents in the commercial market could command salaries three to ten times RLG's permissible limits. On balance, RLG has found it desirable to engage CEOs with strength in the computer field. Such people have sometimes found it difficult to understand, let alone respect, the views of librarians, and relations have not always been the best. Also, the emphasis on computer technology has often been bought at the expense of management sophistication.

8. As has been suggested earlier, the consortium was derelict in dealing with the balance of payments issue. The interlibrary loan situation is a case in point. The dilemma is not unlike that of the United Nations, where the beneficiaries have the votes and are often in no hurry to accommodate themselves to the views of the providers of benefits.

9. Candor forces one to concede that it has been a source of great disappointment that more of the large ARL libraries have not found RLG attractive. Harvard's withdrawal almost certainly adversely affected this prospect. Yet it is gratifying that a number of libraries, including Harvard, that are not full members have elected to participate as associate members: Harvard Law, Harvard Music, and Harvard Fine Arts; Chicago's Fine Arts Library; Boston University Law Library; University of Texas at Austin Law Library; University of Utah Law Library; University of Hawaii at Manoa; and University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Library. Some forty other institutions are active as special members—e.g., Art Institute of Chicago, Brandeis University, Folger Shakespeare Library, Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, Library Company of Philadelphia, Boston Museum of Fine Arts, National Gallery of Art, New York State Library, Pierpont Morgan Library, and Radcliffe College Library.

10. The many research institutions that chose to stay within OCLC certainly have reason to be grateful to RLG. In the opinion of

not a few, the very existence of a research libraries consortium caused OCLC to pay more attention to the special needs of research libraries than it had displayed prior to RLG's founding.

11. The overriding problem of RLG has been that too few university officials at the presidential and financial officer levels appreciate the revolution that is taking place in information handling and the true significance of RLG. Furthermore, they persist in the delusion that revolutionary new technology can be funded out of traditional levels of library support, although experience with computers elsewhere on campus grossly belies this possibility.

12. Finally, the extent to which the existence of RLG tempered the extremely adverse effects of budget reductions during the seventies and eighties has never been adequately appreciated. By emphasizing document delivery and not mere ownership, the founders ushered in a new level of access. University officers who gave RLG grudging, often minimal support will never realize the amount of faculty clamor that they were spared simply because RLG operated to serve promptly and adequately a host of research needs despite battered acquisitions budgets. The progress in applying computer technology to library operations has been noteworthy and, in many respects, indispensable, but the forging of close, productive, and continuing levels of cooperation will, in the final analysis, prove to be equally momentous.

CHAPTER 5

In Pursuit of Preservation

Peter G. Winterble

> If individuals have any sense of the importance of the continuity of the human experience, they can't avoid the problem of preservation of the human record. To fail to do so is, in a sense, to turn your back on history. And it's a kind of an egotistical action of the highest order to think that what's gone before is unimportant. What we're doing here is trying to find a way to *save* what's important from the past. What we've got to do is to make an honest effort to make certain that at least a portion of the past is preserved, not only for our own use, but for the future. Those who will follow us will, I think, rightfully say that we have in a sense failed them if we don't make that honest effort.

Spoken from behind the large desk in his CLR office, these extemporaneous words from Jim Haas make up the final scene in the film "Slow Fires: On the Preservation of the Human Record." They sum up, perhaps as well as any he has written or spoken, the core of his belief in the "preservation enterprise," as it has come to be called by those around him.

Making that honest effort to address the overwhelming problem of the deterioration of library materials has been an abiding theme of Jim Haas's professional life. Viewing early on, at first-hand, the effects of acid paper on the research collections at Johns Hopkins University, the University of Pennsylvania, and Columbia University, he realized that the only adequate solution would require collaborative efforts theretofore unrealized in the library world.

Peter G. Winterble is a Program Officer of the Commission on Preservation and Access.

An important chance to state the case for preservation and collaboration arose when he undertook in 1970 the compilation of a report commissioned by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) under a grant from the U. S. Office of Education. (At the time he was President of ARL and also Chairman of its Committee on Preservation.) In what has often been cited as one of the more appropriate analogies about preservation, Jim Haas wrote: "The process of growing bald and the deterioration of library collections have much in common. It is easy to ignore the loss of one strand of hair at a time, so long as there is overall growth. So it is with book collections. Individual volumes, by virtue of the fragility of the paper on which they are stored, deteriorate and become useless. Their loss is regretted, but feelings of concern are muted by the security generated by annual collection growth figures. However, a time comes when even long hair can't conceal a shining pate, any more than current acquisitions can mask the physical shabbiness and the prominent gaps caused by the disappearance of thousands of volumes made useless by paper deterioration." In the years after his report was written, and with customary wryness, Jim Haas would stroke the thinning hair of his own head as he recounted his analogy.

His ARL/Office of Education report, titled "Preparation of Detailed Specifications for a National System for the Preservation of Library Materials," identified four areas in which much work needed to be done, and which revealed the framework of Jim Haas's own agenda in preservation for the years to come: research; education and training; preservation and conservation in individual libraries; and collective action. And although each of these areas has received detailed attention from Jim Haas during his time as president of the Council, it is the last—collective action—that led eventually to the breakthroughs of the recent past. Indeed, ensuing activities in the first three areas of his four-point program (many of them funded by CLR) served, importantly, to prepare the way for the present preservation activity.

What he realized in the early seventies, and what is now widely known, is that nearly all books printed after 1865 were either brittle or in danger of becoming so, due to the acidic nature of the paper they were printed on. The deterioration process, hastened by the lack of proper environmental conditions in libraries, meant that as much as 80 percent of the collections of the nation's oldest, most prestigious libraries would be lost if there were no intervention.

But in those relatively early days, preservation was not receiving priority attention from library directors. At an ARL meeting in Chicago in January 1972, Jim said: "... there is the continuing, gnawing conviction that some kind of national preservation program is still a valid, if unclear, objective of research libraries." As one reads those words nearly seventeen

years later, it is not hard to guess within whom most of the gnawing was occurring.

Jim Haas joined the CLR board in 1974 and became more involved in the full range of preservation activities supported by the Council, including much of the early research. In 1978, when he left Columbia University to assume the CLR presidency, he emphasized research programs that led to the development of the necessary bibliographic capabilities to sustain a nationwide coordinated preservation program, as well as programs aimed at the educational and managerial development of a new generation of library leaders. At the same time, in the wider university and research library world, preservation officers and departments were being established, and preservation was coming of age as an important discipline within the profession. Much of the focus, however, was on incorporating the rudiments of disaster preparedness, climate control, and preserving local collections, not on collaborative action.

But Jim Haas had not forgotten the grander scheme, the collective action part of preservation. It returned to prominence in 1981, with the establishment of a preservation task force within a joint project of the Council and the Association of American Universities. The AAU/CLR preservation effort—part of a broad-based overview of the future of research libraries and their functions—successfully reflected both (a) the conviction that major library questions could not be addressed without the participation of university administrators who ultimately would have to pay the bills, and (b) the belief that the only possible solutions to library development issues such as the brittle book problem were collaborative. The process, largely due to Jim Haas's efforts, of raising the consciousness of those both within and outside the library world had begun in earnest.

One of the conclusions of the preservation task force was a recommendation that as part of a test of potential for cooperation, regional microfilming facilities should be established. Following a 1984 proposal from CLR, the Exxon Education Foundation provided a significant grant to establish what is now the Mid-Atlantic Preservation Service in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, with a board comprising representatives from several academic institutions. Significantly, the grant also provided funding to begin planning for a national preservation effort, and for the promotion of a wider understanding of preservation issues.

Microfilming the contents of deteriorated volumes is at the heart of the retrospective part of preservation; Jim Haas also sought to continue the proactive side of preservation. Since most publishing was (and is still) occurring on acid paper, a proactive response was to encourage the production and use of more acid-free, alkaline paper. In 1979, he caused to be created a Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity to make recommendations about what could be done to provide more lasting

printed materials—especially the use of acid-free paper. The committee encouraged the establishment of an American National Standards Institute subcommittee that eventually formulated the current standard for acid-free paper, as well as the establishment at the Library of Congress of what has now become its active National Preservation Program Office.

Concurrently, the AAU/CLR task force on preservation evolved into a Committee on Preservation and Access, with several members of the original task force becoming members of the Committee. At its first meeting in 1984, the Committee, building on the discussions that had gone before, made two fundamental decisions concerning the establishment of an effective national program: (1) access to what is preserved is as important as the preservation of information itself, and (2) books would receive first priority in planning for a nationwide program. Facile access to preserved materials came to be seen as the radical part of the emerging preservation plan; useful access capability would rest on the assumption that only the intellectual contents of a book would be preserved. By preserving its contents on microfilm, a previously unusable deteriorated volume could have new life in a variety of formats and could be easily and quickly accessible. Making books the first priority of a national preservation plan was an equally important decision, based in part on the assumption that of all media, books were the single largest source of the disappearing intellectual heritage of the nation.

Both of these decisions—along with the prior notion of the necessity of a truly collaborative effort among libraries—provoked active controversy, disagreement, and nervousness in the library and academic worlds, particularly when implementation of them implied the perceived loss of traditional local autonomy, the need for quick and decisive action on a variety of fronts simultaneously, enormous sums of money, and commitment to a program that was not yet as clearly defined as most librarians wished it to be. Not to be daunted by possible problems, however, Jim Haas continued to operate on his oft-stated maxim that "the only way to eat an elephant is one bite at a time."

The culmination of the Committee's deliberations over eighteen months was the publication in early 1986 of what became the blueprint for the preservation program, the document *Brittle Books*. Included among its recommendations was a call for the establishment of a Commission on Preservation and Access that would be funded by universities and foundations, hire staff, and pursue the work plans that had been outlined in *Brittle Books*. That body was subsequently created, with three Committee members continuing as Commission members, including chairman Billy Frye, vice president for academic affairs and provost, Emory University. From April 1986, when the newly constituted Commission first met, to

the time of this writing, much has occurred at a pace that in retrospect seems mildly dizzying.

The briefest recitation of those events would need to include:

- Jim Haas's successful solicitation of more than a million dollars in funding commitments for the work of the Commission from a variety of important universities and foundations;
- his initial direction of the Commission's tasks;
- CLR support for an international conference of library directors in Vienna on the subject of preservation, under the auspices of the International Federation of Library Associations;
- creation, from concept to national broadcast on public television, of the award-winning "Slow Fires" preservation film, and its wide distribution and use in both film and videocassette formats;
- the hiring of first a program officer and then, in August of 1987, the first president of the Commission, Patricia Battin; and
- involvement with Congress in a process that led first to subcommittee hearings and finally, in September 1988, to approval by Congress of a bill nearly tripling funding of the National Endowment for the Humanities' Office of Preservation, which has emerged as the financial and programmatic keystone of the nationwide preservation microfilming program.

The *Brittle Books* document envisioned the Commission's eventual independent financial and legal status, although no date had been set or imagined for such an event. However, with the efforts of both Jim Haas and Pat Battin, the articles of incorporation were signed on July 1, 1988, and the Commission became an independent nonprofit organization. For this to have occurred in only a little more than two years was the happy coincidence of a number of factors, not the least of which was the level of commitment and moral support for the goals of the Commission's work that had been inculcated by Jim Haas's efforts over the years in the foundation, university, and library communities. At the same time, those funding and supporting the Commission also realized that preservation was an important emerging issue in the cultural and intellectual life of the nation; congressional interest had been soundly established; the "Slow Fires" film had been widely seen and appreciated; and the library community had endorsed the Commission's efforts to continue to build a national program.

Perhaps the greatest significance of the preservation and access program as it has emerged in 1988 is that it serves as a case study for model library cooperation. For the first time, there is clear evidence that a virtual national collection of preserved materials—widely accessible to all—will be the result of the preservation program Jim Haas envisioned nearly two decades ago, and which he has continually worked to shape and form.

Thus, of the many things that Jim Haas has done during nearly forty years in his chosen profession, preservation must rank as one of his greatest and hardest-won successes. In making "that honest effort" in preservation, Jim Haas's special leadership skills came fully into play—in a manner not unlike that of a broken-field runner in the football of his college days. Running through some obstacles, over and around others, speeding up, slowing down, taking the bumps, staying always within bounds, Jim Haas has taken his belief in a nationwide, collaborative preservation program a long way down the field. The end result of his efforts in preservation and access will have fundamental and far-reaching effects on the way research libraries work for both librarian and user.

CHAPTER 6

Professional Library Education

Robert M. Hayes

The Vision

Throughout his career, Jim Haas has committed himself to excellence in academic library management and has envisioned a level of professional library education commensurate with that objective. The first documentation of those views was in a paper prepared for the University of Chicago conference in 1973 and subsequently published in *Library Quarterly*. In a very real sense, that early paper set out the agenda for what became, under his direction, the program of the Council on Library Resources with respect to library education.

The major emphasis of that paper—and, indeed, of the CLR program under Jim's leadership—was on management of the university research library and even of the university itself. He saw the need for adopting management principles as exemplified in the business world. Of course, he recognized the problems in applying those methods in an academic context, illustrating them by reference to Sol Linowitz's commentary, "a liberal arts education isn't a railroad." Even considering those problems, however, in that paper Jim strongly urged that library education should prepare its graduates for management.

Jim believed that the academic library manager should have the tools needed to establish primary and durable objectives, clearly stated so as to be understood by those who would benefit from them and by those who would carry them out. He saw the need for a capability for imaginative planning. He saw the need for professional skills in converting plans into

Robert M. Hayes is Dean of the Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of California, Los Angeles.

actions. He saw the need for risk-taking, combined with an ability to accept results that fell short of objectives and to move forward from them.

At that time, of course, Jim was engaged in his own efforts to improve research library management at Columbia and even to establish the library at a central position in management of the entire range of information resources within the university. Part of the effort was represented by the study carried out under his administration that led to changes in management structure, centralization of information management, creation of a planning office with mechanisms for policy development and refinement, and a program of staff development.

The context at the time was one of impending revolution in libraries as automation became more and more a reality for them. Throughout the country there were studies under way of the application of operations research methods (such as the investigations by Morse, Ackoff, Leimkuhler, et al.). There were research efforts supported by the National Science Foundation, the Office of Education, and the Council on Library Resources (CLR). The Office of University Library Management Studies at the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) established programs at ARL meetings, with surveys of practices and tutorial sessions, as well as a publication series; their Management Review and Analysis Program provided a specific approach to participatory policy planning. All of these activities reflected increasing concern about a process for policy formulation, methods of library planning and decision making, criteria for evaluating costs, changes in library organization, the means for involvement of staff—all seen as necessary if the academic research library was to respond to the changes that were occurring.

This context made the results of Jim's own efforts of far greater significance than simply change at Columbia itself. Those activities provided a clear identification of the skills and knowledge required by such efforts. They highlighted the need for library education, especially in the accredited library schools, to respond to those needs. The implications were evident: library education should provide a better understanding of "good management" and should graduate more individuals trained for management. It should set the stage for the changes that were to come—the "managerial revolution," as Jim characterized it. Jim believed that professional library education should provide:

- knowledge of the research library, comprehension of research library goals, and an ability to relate the research library to institutional performance;
- a capacity to apply management methods, an understanding of management techniques, and the ability to use new tools, including computers, for effective management;

- a capacity to view roles broadly, combined with the ability to deal with staff limitations and with the behavior of individuals in the organization;
- knowledge of the principles of accounting, cost analysis and cost reduction, and budgeting;
- the ability to deal with change, especially with respect to understanding the effects of new technologies, and to plan for the future; and
- skill with mathematical tools and an ability to understand and apply research results.

In all of this, Jim avoided commenting on who was to teach, what they were to teach, and how they should teach. But he did visualize a core of courses covering three central topics: (1) the meaning of "information," including identifying and evaluating the reasons for producing it, acquiring its records, and describing and organizing those records; (2) libraries as organizations, covering the purpose of management and a theory of service; and (3) libraries as parts of the larger society, including their role in scholarship and science, the external factors affecting that role, and the changes occurring in society and societal relationships. He concluded with a comment on the possible relationship between research libraries and library schools:

> My fantasy would see each professional school that offers a specialty in management establish formal ties with a group of perhaps five to ten research libraries for the purpose of capitalizing on library staff expertise for instructional purposes in ways that might benefit the schools and still be functionally realistic for libraries. These ties would also open new ways for cooperative investigation of important topics and might help promote application of research findings to operations. The interactions of academic and operating expertise would broaden teaching and research horizons, and the ways would be opened for development of a formal research library internship program for library school graduates.

That fantasy served as a guiding principle in Jim's subsequent approach to fostering improved education for the professional academic library manager, as embodied in the programs of the Council on Library Resources.

Even today, it serves as a blueprint for the future. In fact, as we examine the potential future directions, not only of CLR programs but of library education, that fantasy will become an objective of increasing importance and value.

The Means

How does one bring a vision to reality? Jim has had to work primarily through others, given the nature of the task and of his own responsibilities. However, in one respect at least, Jim has taken an overt role. He has written and spoken succinctly in identifying important themes, which are summarized below. His views have been crystal clear, consistent, and vigorously presented. The *Library Quarterly* article has been described above as the basis for the vision. In later papers, particularly in CLR annual reports, that vision was amplified, deepened, and made more concrete with respect to specific problems in library management.

Progress in improving library education, though, really must lie with others—library educators, library administrators, professional societies for both librarians and academics, and university administrators. They must see the vision and find the means within their own agendas to bring it to reality. To that objective, then, Jim has brought a great variety of mechanisms for discussion and persuasion.

Central among those mechanisms are committees. They have been a primary tool by which the Council has determined its programs during the period of Jim's leadership. But they have a much wider role as amplifiers of Jim's vision and as a means for involving others in giving substance to that vision. The PETREL (Professional Education and Training for Research Librarianship) Committee, in particular, was established by Jim in the early 1980s to foster the development of CLR's programs in the areas of research and education.

Formal conferences are a second mechanism used by Jim to accomplish objectives, to identify means, and to obtain consensus on how best to proceed. The two Frontiers Conferences held under the sponsorship of the PETREL Committee focused on educational objectives. The first, hosted by UCLA at its Lake Arrowhead Conference Center in 1981, brought together library educators and academic library administrators. Surprisingly, it seems that it was the first time there had been formal discussion of the mutual interests of those two groups. Subsequently, and as a direct consequence of that conference, there were extended discussions as part of relevant professional society meetings. The second Frontiers Conference, held at the University of British Columbia in 1983, followed up on the first by focusing attention on issues related to library automation.

Perhaps the most effective means available to Jim for influencing others is face-to-face, one-on-one personal discussion. It is on such occasions that Jim can best excite the imagination of those who, to whatever degree, share his vision. The interchange of ideas, the testing and adaptation of hypotheses, the identification of means and programs by which objectives

can be accomplished, the positive feedback, the exploration of problems and alternatives—what intellectual stimulus even a brief discussion gives!

Of course, supporting Jim's objectives in all of these methods, whether committees, conferences, or discussions, is the fact that there are financial resources available to bring the vision closer to realization. The activities of committees are funded by the Council, the conferences that fall within the scope of the program can be funded, the ideas that result in suitable projects can be funded. That funding has come because Jim has been able to present his vision to persons who can commit resources to important objectives. Those persons are not easy to convince. They respond not to rhetoric but to clear evidence of societal needs, power of intellect, demonstrated commitment, and the ability to mobilize other resources.

It is important to note, however, that the mere availability of funding is simply not sufficient in and of itself. It can provide the means for support but not the means for accomplishment. Accomplishment of Jim's objectives has absolutely depended upon his efforts to motivate people, to lead them to take the challenges he has presented, and to make them succeed. That has been his great contribution.

Indeed, if there is anything that has been effective in developing library education through the support of the Council on Library Resources, it has been the example set by Jim and his vision. It challenges others to follow that example.

The Themes

At the first Frontiers Conference, Jim commented that

> One of the key issues they've had to face is the need to think through the profession of librarianship itself. If in fact the ground rules are changing—intellectually, economically, technically—what kind of people are required to exert leadership over the coming years? We decided the time was right to examine the process of library education as well as the nature of the profession itself.

In the papers Jim has written, whether or not they explicitly deal with library education as such, there are continuing themes that provide depth for the vision he has and that have implications for library professional education. To a large extent, those themes were embodied in the goals of PFTRET. As the driving force behind that committee, Jim largely determined those goals:

- to recruit the best and brightest to the profession of academic librarianship and to provide them with a rigorous and stimulating basic professional education;

- *to identify current librarians with promise for professional leadership and provide them with exceptional opportunities for training;*
- *to focus attention on fundamental issues facing research libraries;*
- *to raise the quality of research;*
- *to promote communication between practitioners and educators;*
- *to influence the content and structure of professional education for research librarianship; and*
- *to press for improvement in library management.*

These goals will serve as the basis for evaluation as we review the accomplishments.

Underlying those themes specific to education are the broader ones that reflect the contexts in which academic library management occurs—what Jim called "the new library ecology."

- *operational problems: sheer size of collections, rising costs of labor and materials, and applications of new technologies;*
- *interdependence among libraries for the sharing of resources, the need for governance of cooperative enterprises, and the associated costs of cooperation;*
- *the opportunities—and costs—for new means for bibliographic control and organization, avoiding redundant efforts, cumbersome procedures, and excessive complexity;*
- *new means for collection control, complicated by increasing problems with the physical condition of collections;*
- *changing patterns of staff composition and their effects on quality and scope of services; and*
- *the changes occurring in scholarly communication, the resulting new and higher expectations of users, and the necessary effects on acquisition policies.*

Jim felt that these issues force an intense and comprehensive review of the way research libraries work, both individually and together. They imply the formulation of new policies that should involve librarians, faculty, administration, trustees, and students. The result is new demands—intellectual, financial, and organizational—on library management.

The Accomplishments

In the form of specific programs, much has been accomplished in the way of realizing Jim's vision. It is useful to see them in a progression across the typical career paths of librarians as they move into and through

the MLS itself, then into professional practice, and finally to positions of steadily increasing responsibility.

First, and in some respects most fundamental—if Jim's objective of attracting "the best and the brightest" is really to be achieved—are efforts at recruitment to the field, to the MLS, and to academic librarianship. With that aim, programs have been sponsored at Columbia University and the University of Michigan (with emphasis on potential for leadership); at Yale University (to recruit undergraduates); at Rutgers University and Atlanta University (with an emphasis on scientists and engineers); and at Louisiana State University (with an emphasis on computer science). They are all relatively recent and usually in the context of some curricular objective.

In particular, during the past several years, CLR has sponsored experiments at a number of library schools to modify, enhance, expand, and improve their MLS programs, especially as they may relate to needs in academic library management. ARL has served as an aid to CLR by conducting Institutes for Library Educators (in 1984, 1986, and 1988) to assist in identifying areas in which development may be feasible. And, whether as a result of those institutes or of the more specific interests of library schools, experiments in curricular development have been made at the following institutions:

- University of Alabama (modules on library management)
- Atlanta University (science librarianship)
- Case Western Reserve University (information science curriculum)
- University of Chicago (library automation)
- University of Denver (certificate in academic research librarianship)
- Indiana University (continuing education for research librarianship)
- Kent State University (an extended MLS program)
- Louisiana State University (library systems analysts)
- North Carolina Central University (information science)
- University of Oklahoma (resource management)
- Rutgers University (science and engineering librarianship)
- SUNY Buffalo (academic research librarianship)
- University of Tennessee (undergraduate program in information science)
- University of California, Los Angeles (coordinated degree with Fine Arts)
- University of Wisconsin-Madison (program in research methods)

It is too soon to evaluate the impact these efforts have had, either at the institutions themselves or more generally in library education. Overall,

however, it must be said that the success has been, at best, mixed in both respects.

The Council has sponsored post-MLS internship programs in academic libraries for recent library school graduates. One is a multi-institutional program, centered at the University of Chicago and including Northwestern University and the University of Illinois at Chicago; others are at Columbia University, the University of Georgia, the University of Michigan, and the University of Missouri-Columbia. The success of these programs has yet to be determined, but at the least they provide significant means for breaking out of the straitjacket of the "one calendar year" so typical of MLS programs.

A quite different kind of internship is represented by the CLR Academic Library Management Intern Program, in which fifty librarians participated during the period from 1974 through 1988. In much the same pattern, CLR managed for the National Library of Medicine a similar intern program in health sciences libraries, involving nine interns from 1978 through 1980. Such internships provide opportunities for librarians already well established in their careers to gain operating experience with a mentor, a director of an academic (or medical) library, by participating directly in management activities and in research projects, while pursuing extensive self-instruction. The result is a cadre of well-prepared managers now working in a range of academic libraries as well as in other contexts important to the field. This program surely is one of the successes of CLR sponsorship.

Moving further on in career paths, we can refer to CLR efforts, with ARL and the Association of College and Research Libraries, to train a number of librarians to serve as specialists in areas of importance to academic libraries. The aim was to develop a corps of well-trained consultants in instructional methods, management, collection development, and computer applications.

The Faculty/Librarian Cooperative Research program, although ostensibly focused on research, has evident implications for professional education and personal development. Each year, CLR has funded on the order of thirty to forty projects, in which professional librarians work with faculty from a range of disciplines to investigate relatively narrow areas of research. The results for the librarian participants must be an invaluable experience, a real addition to their skills both as professionals and as managers.

The Senior Fellows Program, now conducted biannually at UCLA, provides an opportunity for academic librarians who have reached positions of major responsibility to work together in analyzing significant current issues in management, within the context of both formal course work and informal discussion. To date, in the four times the program has been held, a total of fifty-eight senior librarians have participated. The objectives are

both to assist them individually, in leadership in their own libraries and in furthering of their careers, and to establish a sense of community and common purpose among them. The former objective has been well met, as just a casual review of their professional progress demonstrates. The latter objective has been met to an even greater degree, and the group now represents a resource of incalculable value for future planning.

All in all, at least as far as the development and advancement of individuals is concerned, much has been accomplished. In that respect, the Council on Library Resources under Jim's direction has continued and improved the historic pattern of support for library education by assisting individuals.

But it must be said that in the larger arena of library education, little has been accomplished in the way of fundamental change, despite several projects aimed at curricular development. Library schools in general have MLS programs of only one calendar year, which simply is not enough time to provide adequate coverage of the tools for management, to provide for extensive internships, and to provide opportunities for research. Library schools in general have set requirements for admission that do not demand skills in mathematics or in the technical bases for management. Library schools in general are small, with few students and few faculty. Library schools in general still have curricula that focus on aspects of professional practice rather than on the broader issues in management and in societal and institutional environments.

The Future

The program of the Council on Library Resources in the area of education clearly will continue for years, even decades, to come. The momentum created by Jim Haas's own commitment assures that. Most recently, he presented his program for the future in "The Council on Library Resources: The Fourth Decade." Its two major elements both focus on library education, the first by dealing with research, a topic central to library education in the university, and the second by dealing explicitly with library education.

Program I, Research on Library Management and Operations, will continue the pattern of deep involvement of C.I.R. in issues of primary importance to the future of academic research libraries. A new Research Library Committee has been formed to provide guidance in identifying the critical problems. But the agenda already clearly sets the priorities, and they are focused on problems of *management*—new organizational and staffing structures, new management skills, and improved efficiency.

Program II, Librarianship and Professional Education, then turns to the means by which education for this field can be changed and improved.

As Jim points out in presenting the program, "... the influence of C.I.R. efforts on professional education have been subtle at best, in part because the scale of the Council's involvement has been insufficient."

Of course, there is still a need to continue the past pattern, with its focus on individuals and especially on those with proven records of performance. There is still a need to ensure that those individuals are given every opportunity to build on their own successes. This need will be met by continuation of established programs of demonstrated effectiveness—the Cooperative Research Program, the Academic Library Management Intern Program, and the Senior Fellows Program. Other efforts in continuing education surely will be initiated, tested, and evaluated for their possible contribution in the future.

But the real emphasis in this Program II is on the task of bringing professional education to the level of excellence commensurate with the task of "fueling the future with the women and men of quality required to do the job." Improvement absolutely requires enrichment of the quality of programs for professional preparation—their academic foundation, their faculties, and their curricula.

To that end, Jim is forming a committee on information studies to provide guidance and a sounding board for the ideas that will be the basis for improvement. With the commitment of energies and resources implied by this program, one can hope for the vision of excellence to become a reality.

It is worthwhile to conclude by returning to the statement of that vision as presented in the article in *Library Quarterly* in 1973. Jim ended it with a very specific fantasy, one of partnership between library schools and academic research libraries. The time finally may be right for that fantasy to be realized. Visualize such a partnership, analogous to that between schools of medicine and teaching hospitals. Visualize a curriculum in which the schools consciously focus on the basic science, the theory, and the academic research, while the "teaching library" focuses on instruction in professional practice, on experience through internship, and on applied research. Visualize faculties consisting of appointments of both full-time academic and part-time "clinical" staff, the latter being filled by practicing professionals in the teaching libraries.

The fantasy Jim Haas had fifteen years ago is within our grasp today!

Bibliography

C.I.R. *Annual Report*, 1984-1987.

Haas, Warren J. "Management in Research Libraries: Implications for Library Education." *Library Quarterly* 43, no. 4 (October 1973): 369-84.

——— "Managing our Academic Libraries: Ways and Means." *College and Research Libraries* 40, no. 2 (March 1979): 109-110.

——— "Organizational Structures to Meet Future Bibliographic Requirements." *Library Quarterly* 47, no. 3 (July 1977): 274-84.

——— "The PETREL Program." In *Universities, Information Technology, and Academic Libraries*, edited by Robert M. Hayes, 7-8. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, 1986.

——— "Research Libraries and the Dynamics of Change." *Scholarly Publishing* 11, no. 3 (April 1980): 195-202.

McDonald, John P. "The Results, as Seen by PETREL." In *Universities, Information Technology, and Academic Libraries*, edited by Robert M. Hayes, 165-69. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, 1986.

CHAPTER 7

The Foundation Connection

James M. Morris

There is a fine Latin adjective—"capax"—whose array of meanings comes immediately to mind when I think about Jim Haas. Jim himself will speak repeatedly of the "capacity" to achieve certain goals, particularly of the capacity to manage change, so it is easy enough to fix on that sense of the word. But there are several senses richer still: good at, fitted to, wide, large, spacious. How entirely appropriate the words are to describe Jim's own energies and interests and character, his slant on the world, his dedication to his profession.

I came to know Jim in the mid-1970s, when I had been but a short time at the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. During his term as president of the Foundation in the early 1970s, Nathan Pusey had established its interest in research libraries. John E. Sawyer, who succeeded Mr. Pusey in June 1975, was convinced that the commitment of the Foundation to the field should endure and grow. Though the newest member of the staff, I was given the library portfolio. Jack thought, no doubt, that having just left a university I was the one to have used a library most recently.

But like most faculty members in those days, I knew nothing of the impact technology was beginning to have on library operations. I was content to go from the card catalog to the classics collections (which already showed the ravages of unhappy storage conditions and poisoned paper) with never a thought for sophisticated means of access or a concern for what was going on behind the scenes. I was ten years at a university without knowing the precise location of the university librarian's office. At the foundation I would begin to learn all too much about what was

James M. Morris is Program Director for Higher Education at the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

going on behind the scenes. I now know the location of many librarians' offices, but I can no longer give directions to the book stacks.

The acronyms confounded me initially. Jack Sawyer and I would hand them back and forth in memos to one another as gingerly as if they had thorns, and invariably we transposed a few. The letters I got to know first, and to speak like a mantra, stood for Research Libraries Group. RLG, to whose establishment the Foundation had contributed in 1974, struck me at the time as a kind of fledgling, storefront enterprise. (Its glory days in trailers—though *Stanford* trailers—were still ahead.) It was in the RLG file that I first came upon the name of Warren J. Haas.

As the University Librarian of Columbia, one of the four founding members of RLG, Mr. Haas had written a letter of thanks in July 1974 for the Foundation's support of the enterprise. The tasks he sets for RLG in the letter are the following: "recasting research library operations, improving the effectiveness of interlibrary relationships, and influencing the nature of the processes of research and scholarship." He concedes they are "awesome tasks" and acknowledges "the hazards inherent in this venture," but he shows not the least inclination to flinch or be deterred. There could not have been a more apt or precisely revealing introduction to the man.

At subsequent meetings about the role and mission and, especially, the future of RLG and of research libraries generally, I found myself listening with increasing attentiveness and admiration to the comments of the Columbia University librarian. Here is a wise and temperate voice, I thought—one part Jeremiah, nine parts Solomon. He can make the grandest dream sound practical (dreamed in black and white, if necessary, to keep down the cost), and he gives a sharper contour to even the cloudiest vision.

Over time, Jim and I became friends, though at what point the professional association passed to friendship I cannot recall. The files of the Foundation hold a letter of May 1976 from Jim. Its salutation is "Dear Jack," but the text refers several times to "Mr. Morris." The addressee, however—the president of the Foundation—is a pleasing hybrid, "James Sawyer."

Of far more significance in that letter, which has to do with institutional needs at Columbia attendant upon the emergence of RLG, are recurrent phrases that define the expansive intellectual approach so characteristic of Jim. He speaks of developing "a capacity for change at Columbia," of seeking "to improve our capacity to make change in library operations on a reasonable schedule," and of wanting "to maintain our capacity to support research without simultaneously requiring the kind of expenditure escalation we have seen over the last decade." And he foresees that each library in the country will have to rethink its own program "in the context of

new national capacities." In retrospect, it was clear that there would be no confining Jim to Morningside Heights.

The second set of library-world initials I learned was CLR—not to be confused, Jack and I would remind each other, with CRL, the Center for Research Libraries. (We would usually append to each acronym the appropriate clarifying noun—"the Council" or "the Center"—defeating the point of the shorthand but forestalling conversational chaos.) We learned the impressive history of what CLR ("the Council") had accomplished with some twenty years of support from the Ford Foundation. We heard too that Ford was reluctant to continue as its sole supporter and that Fred Cole was planning to retire as its president. The testimony was overwhelming that, with sustained strong leadership, the Council had a future at least as bright as its past. No other organization was fit to assume its role. The task, then, became to enlist new sources of foundation support and to identify a successor to Mr. Cole who would be able to extend the achievement of the Council. As Harold Howe of the Ford Foundation wrote to Jack Sawyer at the time, "It may be possible to get an absolutely first-rate successor to Fred Cole if there is a reasonably clear picture about support for the future."

Jack Sawyer was prepared to recommend to the Trustees of the Mellon Foundation substantial support for CLR in 1976 if he could reassure them about its leadership. He had come to have immense respect for Jim Haas in the few years he had known him, and he was not alone in thinking that Jim's qualities of savvy, shrewdness, battle-weariness, and enthusiasm would be ideally suited to the presidency. Nor, I suspect, was he alone in turning his powers of persuasion on Jim and urging him to think about leaving Columbia for the Council, where he would have a forum for easy address to the national library community and a platform for recruiting others to causes about which his own beliefs were passionate and long-standing. Let me leave Jim there for the moment, wrestling with his decision, and make my way back to him by another route.

In 1975, Richard Sullivan of the Carnegie Corporation of New York (who was soon to become its treasurer) first convened a group of foundation representatives to discuss the needs of research libraries. The meetings eventually became a happy tradition. (In fact, these meetings of what became known as the Foundation Library Committee occur still, though less frequently than they once did—evidence, I fear, of a regrettable diminution of interest among foundations in research libraries.) I attended my first such meeting in the spring of 1976, with Jack Sawyer and with staff members from Carnegie, Ford, the Lilly Endowment, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. Present as well were Fred Cole (CLR), John McDonald (Association of Research Libraries),

James Skipper (RLG), Douglas Bryant (Harvard University), and Warren J. Haas (Columbia University).

Those were bustling and interesting times for libraries, and the meeting was extraordinarily instructive—as have been so many subsequent meetings over the years of this group, whose membership inevitably changed even as it grew by both invitation and petition. Issues of genuine import crowded each agenda, and the individuals who visited the group regularly to inform and educate the foundations compelled attention.

Meetings of the Committee have been an effective and economical way of educating a range of foundations and of gauging their likely degree of interest in supporting particular projects. It was Dick Sullivan's achievement to have launched the Committee, and it is Jim's to have kept it vital after Dick's death. I wonder whether the library community understands how much support that might have gone elsewhere has come to it in the course of the past decade or so because, early on, Jim caught and focused the attention of some portion of the Committee.

In settings from the Library of Congress to foundation offices to university research libraries, the Committee has had described to it the Bibliographic Service Development Program, the National Periodicals Center, retrospective conversion, a panoply of technological developments and their consequences for libraries, the need to transform the professional education of research librarians, a substantive and progressive research agenda for librarians, a national preservation plan, and a campaign to develop and publicize standards for paper and bindings that will endure. And the list is incomplete.

To each of the sessions, Jim invited guests with the professional expertise to speak knowledgeably and the disposition to speak candidly. Not all topics were of equal interest to individual members of the group, but the meetings gave participants an opportunity otherwise unavailable to get a sense of the research library terrain—and of the dragons lying in wait in caves just below the surface. They were seminars at which one could speak freely or slouch down in silence, without worrying about a grade.

Of course, some of those who attended—and some who decided they had best not attend—could not help but wonder whether the bill for a tuna fish sandwich and some ginger ale might eventually run to several hundred thousand dollars. One digests with difficulty under the circumstances. Apprehensive participants needed reassurance that attendance did not leave them open to subsequent civilized plundering. And, in truth, the pressure, if it was ever more than imaginary, could be brushed aside as lightly as any gnat.

One of the great attractions of the Foundation Library Committee is the opportunity it gives not just for professional exchange but for informal social interaction among foundation staff members—a group of individuals

who share certain interests but who work at such a remove from one another (the distance having little to do with geography) that they rarely come close enough to wave. They seldom collide, and they collude more rarely still.

What Jim said at that 1976 session and at later gatherings of the Committee, and in reports and letters and conversations, had convinced Jack Sawyer that he was the man to trust with the future of the Council on Library Resources—a sane and sensible Ahab for the profession, determined to chase down its elusive demons but smart enough at the critical moment to keep free of the ensnaring line. I do not know how much coaxing it took to win Jim to the idea, but he had given in long before he was elected at the November 1977 meeting of the Council to succeed Fred Cole on January 1, 1978.

Shortly after he assumed the presidency of CLR, Jim visited the Foundation. It was the first of many such visits over the years, but I am astonished still by the ambition of that early agenda. Were we once so innocent and unflappable? Was the world then so open to possibility? My notes show that we spoke first of the need to create a national online bibliographic system. (This was to be the goal of the remarkably successful Bibliographic Service Development Program of the Council, conducted over a period of many years and with support from a group of foundations.) From the bibliographic project we turned to plans for a national periodicals center—a resource for which Jim and many others worked vigorously in those years, trying to persuade various skeptical or resistant or downright hostile groups of the wisdom and workability of the concept, and to rally the sympathetic but fainthearted.

The natural progress of the day's conversation led next to speculation about a national lending library, to be governed perhaps by a national library board. (Do traces yet linger of the high anxiety that animated later discussions of that phantom "national board," which was treated as if it were a small nuclear device?) The morning's session was gaining steam. Jim described plans to lift the level of professional training and education for research librarians—indeed, to transform that education if possible. He spoke as well of an Association of Research Libraries project to train a small army of consultants to work with smaller libraries around the country and improve the effectiveness of their operations. At the bottom of my notes is an incidental reference to "work with U.S.-Japan Friendship Commission for Japanese bibliographers." It is entirely cryptic now, but I am certain it was, on that memorable day, matter-of-factly lucid and an appropriate coda to what had come before.

Où sont les agenda d'antan, eh? And yet the question is not entirely fair because as I consult notes on other conversations with Jim down the years, I find no constriction of imagination or dimming of vision. Quite

the contrary. No session was complete unless Jim proposed at least one unachievable goal, toward which work was to begin the next day.

There are those who take a kind of self-indulgent satisfaction in contemplating the ideal and taking its remoteness as a justification for immobility. Not Jim, whose immediate instinct is to identify people who can sprint the distance. Among the many traits I have come to admire over the years in this wise, generous, and utterly dedicated man is his ability to (or, perhaps better, his inability *not* to) invest each problem, each opportunity, with a distinctly human face. Who needs to be involved? Who needs to be informed? Who can contribute expertise? Who can contribute dollars? "I've spoken to A" and "I've enlisted B" and "I'm thinking of calling C" and "Who should be D through Z?"

Think of each goal in terms of people—people who can be taught, encouraged, motivated, persuaded, stirred to achievement. And gradually, what had seemed a distance impossible to close, across a landscape as alien as the moon's, is crisscrossed by a freeway or two—and the ideal is just three exits ahead.

A small group of university presidents met at the Mellon Foundation in July 1988 to discuss higher education and the common needs of research universities. The conversation turned eventually to the cost of maintaining research libraries, and the word "periodicals" seemed to come simultaneously to the lips of each member of the group. The word hung in the air—in capital letters trailed *not* just by an exclamation point but by a train of those furious typographical symbols that suggest what is otherwise unprintable. As the president pondered and fretted, they hit upon the notion of establishing somewhere in the country a central facility that might collect periodicals—particularly costly and little-used periodicals—and make them available in some form for a reasonable charge to institutions around the country. Surely technology is up to the task, and imagine the consequences for library budgets. They thought the Foundation should encourage and support such a facility, and urge others to do the same.

As they spoke with mounting enthusiasm of the idea upon which they had stumbled serendipitously, I recalled the elaborate plans a decade ago to establish a National Periodicals Center—the extended debate, the effort at reason and conciliation in which Jim Haas was so central a figure. I traced for the presidents the brief trajectory of the imagined Center, and they seemed puzzled. Why did such a good idea not succeed, they wondered. Why indeed, I thought. Was the idea simply ahead of its time, and in this, as in much else, have others begun to catch up with Jim Haas? Or rather, not quite catch up. For he has moved many steps ahead of them in the interim—to places where, a decade hence, they will perhaps find their way.

CHAPTER 8

The Art of International Librarianship: The CLR-IFLA Style

Herman Liebaers
Margreet Wijnstroom

Warren J. Haas—like Verner Clapp and Fred Cole, the previous presidents of the Council on Library Resources—has brought his own personal interest and commitment to the cause of international library cooperation; all three presidents have contributed their different and salutary ways of looking at global library issues. In serving as co-authors of this chapter, we hope to reflect one of the most rewarding features of international librarianship: cooperation in friendship. Knowing that Jim Haas fosters that same feeling, we requested the privilege of writing this tribute together.

Other papers in this Festschrift undoubtedly will describe in more detail the specific character traits of Jim Haas and his many achievements. From their international vantage point, the authors can only dwell on some features that become clearer when observed from a distance.

An inevitable question posed by non-Americans when meeting an American is, "Is he or she a typical American?" Most Europeans (it must be stated with regret) hold a monolithic view of Americans. The superficiality of this view is made clear by comparing the three presidents of CLR. Those who have known them all will have serious doubts about the

Herman Liebaers is a former director of the Royal Library, Belgium, and a member of the Board of Directors, Council on Library Resources.
Margreet Wijnstroom is the former Secretary General, International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions.

characteristics of a typical American. The obvious answer emerges when trying to characterize the typical European: differences will always remain.

This being said, it cannot be denied that in dealing with CLR a number of fundamental differences between the U.S. and Europe become apparent, and constantly must be kept in mind. This fact applies even to the authors, although it may be added that they both consider themselves to be Europeans with a truly international experience and outlook.

So, who then is the American Haas? A man of substance, who blends wisdom and modesty, seriousness and lightheartedness. This profile stands with him in all his endeavors, and will appear no doubt as variations on the same theme in other chapters. However, let us confine ourselves a moment to the field of international library affairs. Jim Haas's style is far remote from the French rhetoric. Nothing is achieved just because it is beautifully said. On the contrary, Jim relies on the facts and figures resulting from associative reasoning, from sensible discussion and argumentation, and most of all from a shared trust.

Nor is he guilty of British insularity. He is allergic to borders and looks askance at those who tend to withdraw into their own cherished castles. And, to take a sly dig at the Dutch, too—in order to save the feelings of any French and British readers!—his talk or writing will never sound "double Dutch," although his name may suggest a Dutch origin.

A careful listener, he does not simply pretend to consider the opinions of others. In this respect his procedure may be called transparent. He behaves as an equal among equals, while others make him *primus inter pares*. Constantly reviewing the state of the art, he quickly spots problems and tentatively consults friends and colleagues regarding their solution. He then proceeds on a course to effect needed changes or improvements.

In this context, it is good to dwell for a moment on his conception of a colleague. The term "colleague" is used less in the U.S. than in Europe, and the term "friend" more. Colleague and friend stand in a different relation. In Europe, colleague has a more specific corporate connotation, without necessarily going as far as the popular saying at the university of Heidelberg, "God invented the professor, while the devil discovered the colleague." The French "cher ami" is so much used that it has lost any sense of kindredness. With the profile in mind of the American to whom these lines are offered, one is tempted to say that a friend is a colleague who shares a similar attitude toward the basic values of life, but whose field of activity does not necessarily coincide with one's own. A common denominator such as "scholarly communication" allows Jim Haas to use the same language whether he speaks to a university administrator, publisher, teacher, CLR Board member, or CLR staff member. In each of them he sees a representative of organizational structures, but the individual comes first.

Returning to his manner in dealing with a plan, a topic, or a problem, the second stage in his procedure normally is to surround himself with a small, informal group of qualified advisors, who help him to formulate his basic thinking in a first draft that is no more than a provocative handout to a wider circle. Further consultation results in a revised draft—still a tentative statement—which thereafter is put before the CLR Board. An excellent example is the recent program on preservation and conservation, which never could have been implemented without the support of the scholarly community.

It is also typical of Jim Haas's response to specific problems, such as the "brittle books" problem, that after a careful drafting of a program of action he seeks and finds an independent implementation—for instance, the setting up of a new Commission on Preservation and Access. As this important program was brought to the active consideration of the world at large, IFLA was fortunate to be chosen as one of the structured channels for raising awareness and joining forces internationally. Examples of possible programs still under consideration are the academic background of information studies and education for international librarianship.

Is Jim Haas's way of working in the international environment really so exceptional, or is it just a reflection of his normal domestic proceedings? Both hypotheses are valid. Borders, whether they are political, professional, educational, or geographical, tend to lose their sharp edges in the products of his mind by virtue of the perceptive way in which he proceeds.

The distinction between national and international, between American and non-American, is fading quickly into a reminiscence of the past, as IFLA has experienced to its great benefit. It must be stated that the former presidents of CLR, both Verner Clapp and Fred Cole, were more than fair to IFLA, and inclined to react positively to requests, which came to them mainly through Foster Mohrhardt and Robert Vosper. Some may have already forgotten that without support from CLR, the appointment of a full-time Secretary General of IFLA never would have been possible in 1971. CLR provided support for the first three years. Although one can never say in retrospect that IFLA then would have ceased to function, one can safely state that in any case IFLA's development would have stagnated in a time when the information explosion and the revolution in information handling were calling for efficient management. The modern IFLA as we know it today as a solidly structured bridge for international cooperation could well name one of its supporting pillars after CLR!

In more recent times, in particular during Jim Haas's presidency, the assistance of CLR almost imperceptibly underwent a transition from a much-appreciated helping hand from America to the world at large into an equal partnership. In fact, international involvement creeps slowly but inescapably to the top of the Council's priorities.

When we look at the situation from a different angle, another pattern of international cooperation arises: European origin; early and efficient American cooperation; later, careful Socialist adherence; and, finally, an opening toward the Third World. IFLA was no exception in this pattern. Although equal partnership is strived for, the European attitude toward national borders is not always as advanced as the Europeans like to claim. After all, nationalism was a European invention, and the after-effects still cling to even the most internationally minded European nationals.

A significant advantage of American citizens over their European counterparts is their independence from governments and state-dominated structures when trying to pursue new prospects. In Europe one is inclined to think constantly in terms of state subsidies (sports sponsoring is the main exception), and if those are not forthcoming, the initiatives are dropped. But in North America the power of the nonprofit sector, based on private initiative and capital input, is considerable and knows no equivalent anywhere else in the world.

Jim Haas's involvement with the Foundation Library Committee, a group of representatives of major foundations, allowed him to expand existing programs and to explore new avenues. It was proof of the action an independent, public-minded individual can take in a country that is less state dominated than many others. Although Japan is beginning to develop a similar strategy, predominantly influenced by the U.S. example, in Europe the foundations still work mainly in splendid isolation. Taking the information sector as example, it is obvious that cooperation along the lines of CLR would offer boundless opportunities for a series of specific action plans. Less dependence on the slow and erratic state mechanisms would make it easier to translate the achievements of the New Continent into European terms.

The visibility of the library as an institution with its own responsibility is low in Europe as compared to the United States. This difference can be explained in many ways, but independence from state oriented thinking is undoubtedly a major component. The relation between the library and the community to which it belongs is complex everywhere, but when it comes to visibility the action of independent individuals cannot be overstated.

It is not always necessary to use many words to describe achievements. In fact, it may be more convincing to give the bare facts and figures, which are, more often than not, more dazzling than the finest circumlocution. Jim Haas himself gave a striking example of this approach in his contribution to the *Festschrift for Margreet Wijnstroom*.[1] There he illustrates with a dry list of CLR grants to IFLA from 1971 to 1987 how innovative and stimulating the CLR-IFLA relationship has become. Some marginal comments on the grants listed in that article may be given here.

C.I.R's funding of IFLA in 1971 "to enable it to institute reforms and operate at an effective professional level while becoming self-supporting" meant, in bold lettering, that IFLA was re-created. In that same year, an enormous step forward in standardizing library processing methods was made when C.I.R contributed funds to "establish a permanent Secretariat for the IFLA Committee on Cataloguing as a center to promote and coordinate the international standardization of cataloguing practices." An idealistic vision was herewith materializing, and would lead to a revolutionary international undertaking. Now, nearly two decades later, it is difficult to imagine a world without Universal Bibliographic Control (UBC), and to realize that it was through individual perception and the perseverance of those colleagues who really could visualize the future that such a pioneering decision was made. During many of the years that followed, projects undertaken in the framework of UBC figure prominently in the list of C.I.R grants, together giving an impressive overview of progress on key issues transcending national borders.

The professional coordination activities conducted by the IFLA Professional Board, with managerial support from the IFLA office in The Hague (the work of the forty Sections and Round Tables), only really got off the ground by virtue of generous C.I.R support in the crucial 1970s. Without it, IFLA would have remained an empty shell with little attraction for potential members. To be able to work with professional counterparts from other countries and to discuss, evaluate, and learn is a *conditio sine qua non* for the functioning of an international organization such as IFLA. And C.I.R, once again, set these wheels in motion.

In 1983, C.I.R provided a grant of $114,000 (the actual amount of grants to IFLA in the period 1971-87 is nearly one million US$) to "plan new IFLA core programmes—including conservation and preservation, transborder data flow and related problems of data exchange, and further development of International MARC—and to establish a management structure that will assure effective administration and future funding of these programmes." This meant no less than the initiation of the Programme Management Committee, with a Programme Development Officer to stimulate and coordinate the core programmes of Universal Bibliographic Control, International MARC (UBCIM); Universal Availability of Publications (UAP); Preservation and Conservation (PAC); and Universal Dataflow and Telecommunication (UDT), all housed in national libraries around the world. Many hold the view that these core programmes represent the real values of

> international library cooperation in the next decades. That IFLA could embark on the demanding task of developing these programs is—apart from the national libraries concerned—mainly due to the trust placed by C.I.R. in IFLA and all the international professional implications it stands for.

As was already briefly mentioned, it may be expected that C.I.R. will address itself in the near future to the question of whether the time has come to structure information studies as a new academic discipline, not only in the United States but also elsewhere. It is well known that in Europe the scholarly approach to this subject originally took the form of the systematic study of the history of the book and learning. Germany played a leading role in this field. Later, under the influence of the development of social sciences within the academic programs, the trend was to transfer the focus to the place of libraries and documentation and information centers within the communication sciences. C.I.R. has now taken the lead in the development of programs to train a new type of librarian, which ultimately will eradicate the existing differences in education and vision between scholarly librarians in Europe, the United States, and elsewhere. A greater acceptance by the community served and a better professional interrelationship should be the result—a bold initiative if ever there was one![1]

The conclusion to be drawn from the previous remarks could be phrased in terms of a British understatement: the impact of C.I.R. in general, and Jim Haas in particular, on international library cooperation is considerable. If C.I.R. had not assisted IFLA in implementing its ideals by translating them into well-planned programs, IFLA would not be what it is today. Progress would have been slow, and frustrations so great that many would have been discouraged. Instead, international library cooperation has flourished, and has taken chances whenever offered the opportunity.

Those who have been close to the driving forces behind IFLA feel fortunate in having had the satisfaction of working together with one of the most creative librarians in the field, who left the library to serve it better. If Jim Haas would sit back for a moment and try to visualize an IFLA without a full-time Secretariat, without professional coordination, without UBC, UAP, PAC, and UDT, he would be justified in displaying a contented smile before refueling and soaring forward in pursuit of new goals.

Or would he consider these words as double Dutch . . . ?

Notes

1. Haas, Warren J. "IFLA and C.I.R., 1971-1987." *IFLA Journal* 13, no. 3 (1987): 227-28.

CHAPTER 9

Warren J. Haas and the Influence of His Publications

Martin M. Cummings

This chapter examines Warren J. Haas's significant influence on librarianship as reflected in his professional publications since the beginning of his career as a librarian and administrator. His writings reflect clearly those issues and developments that were important during the past three decades of library history.

There are several other anonymous publications resulting largely from Jim Haas's pen, although they may have been published as institutional or organizational documents (e.g., CLR annual reports). However, the formal publications that I have abstracted provide a succinct and comprehensive account of his involvement with and influence on national and international library affairs.

1. "We Knocked on Every Door." *Library Journal* 77 (February 1, 1952): 177-78, 180.

As Head, Extension Division, Racine (Wisconsin) Public Library, Haas organized a survey of the Village of Waterford to determine the reading habits and resources of the community and to stimulate use of the library through associated publicity and public relations. He concludes from the analysis of data that much needed to be done to improve community library service, but improvement of the book collection alone provided no assurance that library service would be improved. "More than anything else, Waterford needs active help from a professional librarian—perhaps one day a week would serve to make the library a part of the community."

From this modest beginning, Haas devoted the next thirty-seven years to studying how libraries can better serve the needs of their user communities.

2. "Cooperative Library Service for Higher Education: A Library Research Program Report." New York: Council of Higher Educational Institutions in New York City, 1960.

Serving as a full-time consultant to the Council of Higher Educational Institutions in New York City, Haas studied how higher education students in metropolitan New York could be assured of high-quality library resources. The design of the study, the collection and analysis of data, and the study's conclusions and recommendations represent a highly constructive library user model that may have practical applications now, a quarter of a century later.

In particular, Haas calls for "an extensive and purposive cooperative program of library service" with the intent of assuring the availability of excellent library resources through effective multi-institutional cooperative operations. He recommends that the focus of the cooperative program be a system of supplementary academic libraries with an integrated regional administrative arrangement. This concept may properly be viewed as the forerunner of the regional and national library consortia developed in the next decade. It may have also served as a prototype for cooperative cataloging, photoduplication, and bibliographic services, which are now available through several networks of library services. This report reveals the imaginative and creative thought that Haas has demonstrated in his service to academic and research library users.

3. "Student Use of New York's Libraries." *Library Trends* 10 (April 1962): 529-40.

Working from the data gained through the study of cooperative library service for higher education, Haas details the determinants of university students' library use, including the academic characteristics of the students; the geographical relationship between location of library to student homes, schools, or place of work; and the quality of library service available at the students' own universities. The frequency of use of libraries was measured in the context of these variables. Based on an understanding of the reasons for selective library use and causes for dissatisfaction, Haas concludes that a system of supplementary academic libraries should be built and operated in the metropolitan New York area.

4. "Statewide and Regional Reference Service." *Library Trends* 12 (January 1964): 405-12.

Several years later, while serving as Associate Director, Columbia University Libraries, Haas demonstrated his continued interest in public library

systems by describing and analyzing the reference services that were available through state and regional organizations. He concludes that, in large measure, library systems supported by public funds have as their principal objective the provision of "middle level" service to individuals who do not have access to a substantial collection. He suggests that librarians who administer such systematic services should pay special attention to analyzing the costs in all segments of their system activities. He also calls for research involving the relationship between theoretical service capacity of system resources and the actual use made of these resources.

In this paper we find early evidence of Haas's critical interest in library performance and library economics, subjects he stimulated and supported two decades later as president of C.L.R.

5. "Future Developments in Library Facilities in Independent Liberal Arts Colleges." In *New Prospects for the Small Liberal Arts College*, edited by Sidney S. Letter, 61-72. New York: Teachers College Press for the Institute of Higher Education, 1968.

Since Haas had served as Acquisitions Librarian at Johns Hopkins University and then as Associate Director of Columbia University Libraries, it is interesting that his first publication after being appointed Director of Libraries at the University of Pennsylvania was concerned with planning for construction or renovation of library facilities in college libraries. Apparently stimulated by his experience in upgrading elements of university library facilities and the rapid introduction of new technologies applicable to library operations, Haas had served as a consultant to several colleges and universities involved in library planning.

This paper reviews trends in library architecture and the relationship between new technologies and the changing role of the library in the college. Haas concludes that new technology will not replace the old, but rather will enhance it. Thus he did not believe that there was a need for drastic modification in library buildings to accommodate technology. He suggests that the only things that might produce significant change in the college library in the next twenty years (1968-1988) were the process of teaching and the reorganization of colleges.

Although some critics might suggest that this is a highly conservative, traditional point of view, in fact most existing libraries were able to make modifications to accommodate new computer and communications technologies. It is only very recently that the utilization of new educational technologies (audiovisual systems and computer-assisted learning) and the increase in special activities such as preservation, online catalogs, and the massive use of major bibliographic utilities has forced a serious reexamination of library functional design. Those libraries that accepted Haas's

recommendation that construction lead to flexibility rather than extremes of radical design have found the adaptation easier and less expensive.

6. "The Role of the Building Consultant." *College and Research Libraries* 30 (July 1969): 365-68. (Originally appeared in the *Quarterly of the Society for College and University Planning*, 1968.)

Haas summarizes his experience as a library building consultant, providing an outline of the distinct steps that need to be followed in the planning process. He suggests that the consultant needs to be involved in 1) the development of the initial program document that reflects the objectives of the institution; 2) the process of program development and refinement of definitions and standards; 3) preliminary design concepts and schematic layouts; 4) review and verification of the architect's final design with regard to meeting objectives; and 5) final review of working drawings and specifications.

This article clearly defines the range of the consultant's role in assisting institutional planners. It reflects a long-standing interest that persists and is reflected in his protege, C. Lee Jones, who has engaged in library building consulting successfully for the past two decades.

7. "Preparation of Detailed Specifications for a National System for the Preservation of Library Materials: Final Report." Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1972.

In 1971, Haas served as Chairman of the ARL Committee on Preservation of Research Library Materials. Building on several earlier ARL studies and many discussions, he authored a report proposing approaches to collective and cooperative actions for preservation and recommending specific steps to implement preservation programs. Although the report reflects a synthesis of many viewpoints, it is clear that Haas's insights and suggestions serve as the framework that eventually led to the creation of a Commission on Preservation and Access fifteen years later. It is noteworthy that Haas maintained a sustained and vigorous advocacy for a national program to preserve deteriorating books while most other members of the library community showed little concern for the problem. Only a handful of major research libraries made any significant effort to deal with the problem of deteriorating library materials.

The Council on Library Resources supported research on the permanence and durability of paper more than a quarter of a century ago, yet it has been only in recent years that an effort has been made to apply the findings of this research—namely, the chemical neutralization of acid paper to improve durability. Whereas the Library of Congress has developed a

large-scale program to accomplish this goal, the National Library of Medicine, the New York Public Library, and several university libraries have engaged in microfilming their deteriorating materials for preservation of the printed record.

The ARL report proposed that a national library corporation be created to serve as the cohesive force for undertaking major preservation ventures effectively. It is this seminal concept that has been transformed into the present organizational arrangement: namely, a Commission on Preservation and Access that provides leadership and coordination while the National Endowment for the Humanities and several private foundations provide critically needed funding for planning and operations.

8. "Tragedy About to Happen: The Deterioration of Book Paper." *Columbia Library Columns* 22 (November 1972): 22-27.

In a short paper, Haas compares the process of paper deterioration with growing bald. "It is easy to ignore the loss of one strand of hair at a time, so long as there is overall growth. So it is with book collections." He points out that for scholars and librarians who see the insidious erosion of their collections, the preservation problem is frustrating and depressing.

Haas calls for libraries to preserve text using microfilming and to acquire reprinted materials as needed. He also points out that paper deterioration is slowed by the use of air cooling and filtering systems. The concerns expressed in this paper are reflected subsequently in his determined efforts over the next two decades to construct a national program to deal with the problem of brittle books.

9. "Management in Research Libraries: Implications for Library Education." In *Management Education: Implications for Libraries and Library Schools*, 89-104. Proceedings of the Thirty-sixth Annual Conference of the Graduate Library School, University of Chicago, April 9-10, 1973. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973. Also published in *Library Quarterly* 43 (October 1973): 369-84.

In this paper, Haas explores the management processes used in research libraries. In a carefully constructed analysis of the relevant literature and his own experience as a library director at Columbia University, he suggests, among many observations, that 1) there is a shortage of research librarians trained to perform management analyses; 2) the need for change in research libraries is poorly comprehended; 3) the application of research results to ongoing operations is difficult to accomplish; 4) many librarians do not fully understand what effective management is; and 5) research library

operations are growing increasingly complex as a result of new technologies and changing interlibrary relationships that affect library performance.

These factors, among others, stimulated an intense interest in library management within the Association of Research Libraries and, to a lesser extent, within some library schools. Haas also suggests that librarianship is not a single profession but rather "an aggregate of professions and technical specialties, all of which are essential to effective research library operation." Library management is one of those professions. My own experience at the National Library of Medicine confirms his observations that the capabilities and responsibilities of research libraries are increasingly governed by factors external to the library and that computer, communications, and photographic technologies are expanding library capabilities to improve services and increase library products.

Haas calls for a program of library education for management, including a comprehension of goals, a capacity to develop and apply appropriate management methods to operations, and stimulation of imaginative interest among students. This prescription for a new educational curriculum remains pertinent for current professional education. His discussion of the relationship between research libraries and library schools reminds us that these reforms are long overdue. This paper deserves the attention of university administrators and educators as well as librarians. It stands as a major challenge and contribution to librarianship.

10. "The Impact of Institutional Change on Research Libraries in the United States." In *Issues in Library Administration*, 3-14. Papers presented at the Second United States-Japan Conference on Libraries and Information Science in Higher Education, Racine, Wisconsin, October 17-20, 1972. New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.

In this paper, Haas addresses the effect on research libraries of changes in university educational structure and organization. He describes the forces promoting educational change in the 1970s and attempts to clarify some of the educational issues that have generated conflict between those who would direct university activities to achieve national goals and those who view university programs as important and essential without reference to public policy.

He also discusses changes in the teaching and learning process as important influences on the ways information is managed and made available. The decline in reliance on classroom teaching due to the use of new communications technologies leads to instructional flexibilities heretofore not easily achievable. New forms of university administration and gover-

nance, associated with demands for involvement in decision making, have led to a management revolution that has a clear impact on libraries.

He calls for imaginative and innovative responses by librarians who face the need to modify traditional technical and readers' services to meet these changing educational programs. The nature of library roles will vary with the differences in institutional systems of instruction and student body composition. He exhorts libraries to become integral parts of their universities, not simply appendages to them.

Finally, he returns to his early interest in cooperative library activities to provide more efficient support to the world of scholarship. The increased scope of library responsibilities will require special management skills that will enable librarians to understand the new educational processes as well as those new operational opportunities offered by computer and communications technologies.

Library directors and professional librarians in colleges and universities will profit from a review of this perceptive and stimulating essay.

11. Yavarkovsky, Jerome, and Warren J. Haas. "The Columbia University Management Program." *Libri* 25 (September 1975): 230-37.

In this paper, the authors describe how they converted a management consulting firm's review of Columbia University Libraries into new organizational and administrative structures. The successful implementation of proposed changes came as a result of active staff participation in the process. The strategy of involving key staff members in evaluating the consulting firm's recommendations led to their ready acceptance of the general proposals while adding refinements to the detailed plan.

A principal recommendation called for coordinating all of the University's information resources with academic programs. To accomplish this goal, a new position—Vice President for Information Services and University Librarian—was created within a reorganized university administration. Jim Haas was appointed to this position, thus becoming the first university librarian to be responsible for the computer center as well as the library. Whereas other universities have subsequently followed this organizational pattern, few research librarians have been entrusted with this important responsibility.

This appointment suggests not only that Jim Haas was an extraordinary, broadly based librarian, but also that there is a current need to develop more professionals who, like him, will be competent to lead universities through the evolutionary changes that attend the introduction of new technologies in managing academic information resources.

12. Notes on *Ordeal of the Union* by Allan Nevins for *'76 United States-iana*. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1976.

This very brief historical note calls our attention to the creative and highly productive writing of historian Allan Nevins, whose first four volume publication, *Ordeal of the Union*, describes our country in transition during the period 1847-61. This publication was followed by four additional volumes that focused on the Civil War, entitled *The War for the Union*. Haas's review was included in a publication containing seventy-six works of American scholarship relating to America, issued on the occasion of our nation's bicentennial year.

13. Notes on *A Brief Narrative of the Case and Trial of John Peter Zenger* for *Thirteen Colonial Americana*. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1977.

This short article reveals Haas's appreciation of history and demonstrates his scholarly interests and talent. He provides an interesting account of the arrest and imprisonment of a publisher (John Peter Zenger) whose political and satirical discussion of New York's government policy led to an extraordinary set of legal and extralegal events. Alexander Hamilton came from Philadelphia to assist in Zenger's successful defense against a charge of seditious libel. Revision of the law in England and America subsequently protected a free press.

Haas points out how the Zenger case underscored the fact that, in a republic, the concerns of the populace can influence the molding of the law.

14. "Managing Change." In *Japanese and U.S. Research Libraries at the Turning Point*, 190-97. Proceedings of the Third Japan-U.S. Conference on Libraries and Information Science in Higher Education, Kyoto, Japan, October 28-31, 1975. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1977.

Haas discusses factors that influence change or control the direction of research libraries: the potential of technology, limits on resources, and expectations of people. He provides brief descriptions of the changes effected at Columbia University Libraries and The Research Libraries Group, which resulted from planned efforts to determine and control their future direction. He concludes that the responsibility for initiating the process of change in libraries rests with senior library administrators. He

suggests that, in general, library administrators need a broader array of skills than they now possess.

This paper reflects the beginning of Haas's sustained interest in managing change that is evident in many of his subsequent publications and in several special programs that he initiated at the Council on Library Resources—for example, a highly successful seminar on the economics of research libraries.

15. "Organizational Structures to Meet Future Bibliographic Requirements." In *Prospects for Change in Bibliographic Control*, 40-50. Proceedings of the thirty-eighth Annual Conference of the Graduate Library School, University of Chicago, November 8-9, 1976. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977. (Also published in *Library Quarterly* 47 (July 1977): 274-84.

Haas assesses the status of the management of bibliographic control efforts and suggests an approach to dealing with the concept of a national bibliographic system. He points out that the costly and inefficient process of redundant cataloging leads to the expenditure of at least $330 for each title cataloged and added to the ARL member libraries. With 300,000 discrete titles being added annually, this amounts to an expenditure of almost $100,000,000 for the aggregated effort of approximately 100 research libraries alone.

In calling for a "system" of acceptable bibliographic control, Haas defines the tasks that needed to be performed at the level of record creation, maintenance, and preservation of the bibliographic files and the production and distribution of bibliographic products. He points out the importance of planning for the managerial and organizational process to succeed in building a complete national bibliographic system requiring the involvement of many libraries, publishers, and indexing and abstracting services. In addition, he suggests that the Library of Congress and the Association of Research Libraries find a way to assume the responsibility for formulating and testing the performance of the bibliographic mechanisms to be created.

Although the exact arrangement he proposed did not materialize, the same effect was accomplished with the Council on Library Resources acting as the stimulus and partial sponsor of the planning phase. Haas defined an approach that he ultimately modified to achieve successfully the purpose for which the planning was undertaken. There are now several major bibliographic utilities that, along with the three national libraries, serve as the national bibliographic apparatus.

16. "Future Prospects." In *American Libraries as Centers of Scholarship*, 43-64. Proceedings of a Convocation held at Dartmouth College

on June 30, 1978, marking the fiftieth anniversary of Fisher Ames Baker Memorial Library. Hanover, N.H.: Dartmouth College, 1978.

Haas speaks of the future library as the new President of the Council on Library Resources. He suggests that change is required in how libraries should serve scholars and specifies six necessary areas for improvement. They are so carefully articulated that I quote them directly.

> "I. The ideal BIBLIOGRAPHIC STRUCTURE should permit identification by scholars of information pertinent to their work and indicate how and where that information can be most readily obtained.
>
> "II. The policies of individual academic libraries that govern the acquisition, retention, and preservation of RESOURCES FOR RESEARCH, while necessarily reflecting immediate institutional goals, should support the long-term interests and concerns of scholarship, as well.
>
> "III. A COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK is essential to the success of future bibliographic and access systems. From the point of view of the scholar, a bibliographic inquiry or a request for a needed item should not necessarily be limited by the records or the holdings of a single library. If necessary, the inquiry should be automatically processed by a nationwide bibliographic system and the request should be routinely filled by the appropriate sources, whether local or remote.
>
> "IV. The COMPOSITION OF THE STAFF of every library should reflect, by the skills and specialization of individual members, the distinctive functions and characteristics of that library. Libraries that are centers of scholarship and research are complex by definition, and the ideal staff of such a library might best be viewed as an aggregation of competent members of different, complementary professions, sharing the same set of objectives.
>
> "V. The MANAGEMENT of research libraries should, above all else, focus on (a) the reduction of costs of technical operations, (b) the concentration of talent and effort on activities that relate to the purposeful development of collections and the provision of service that directly supports teaching and research, and (c) the appropriate utilization of existing and newly evolving national and regional capacities to supplement resources and provide bibliographic support.
>
> "VI. An expanded and continuing RESEARCH EFFORT should be developed and maintained to accumulate data, test hy-

potheses, and make possible the planning required to establish a library system that effectively supports scholarship."

Each of these interrelated topics is discussed in sufficient detail to allow the reader to understand what the library of the future needs to do to become a center of scholarship. It is clear that during the past decade Haas has put in place the strategy to meet this objective. This paper should be considered a classic in the library literature. It deserves to be reprinted for wide distribution among scholars and librarians.

17. "The History and Present Program of the Council on Library Resources." In *International Symposium on National Planning for Library Service Networks*, 27-38. Proceedings of a conference to mark the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the National Diet Library, Tokyo, Japan, November 28-30, 1978. Tokyo: National Diet Library, 1980.

This paper was presented as a lecture in which Haas reviewed the twenty-year history of the Council on Library Resources. He briefly highlights the accomplishments of the Council while pointing out the shift in priorities that took place after Verner Clapp retired as president in 1968 and Fred Cole became CLR's second president.

The Council's early interests in research, technological development, and coordinated bibliographic control were broadened to include programs related to library management skills, identification of library user needs, and some concern with professional education for librarianship. Haas pays special attention to CLR's efforts to improve international as well as national library service, particularly through its support of the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions.

He characterizes the current CLR program under his direction as being concerned principally with bibliographic control, library management, development of special research collections, professional education, and analysis and planning. It is interesting that Haas makes no mention of preservation needs even though he had already identified this as an important national problem ten years earlier. Throughout, he stresses that planning is a continuing process and that changes in library programs should be made when the need becomes evident.

18. "Managing Our Academic Libraries: Ways and Means." In *New Horizons for Academic Libraries*, Theme Papers Presented at the First ACRL National Conference, Boston, Massachusetts, November 1978. New York: K.G. Saur, 1979. Also published in *College and Research Libraries* 40 (March 1979): 109-19.

In this paper, Haas raises several key issues related to the changing role of libraries. He asks, "Can libraries as organizations expand capabilities and still be intellectually and financially viable, and can librarians build the substance of this profession and still maintain the pride of personal accomplishment in the process?" In this context, Haas discusses cooperative programs such as cooperative collection development, coordinated preservation projects, and interlibrary loans. He cites the example of OCLC as a successful library cooperative and analyzes in depth the prospects for the proposed National Periodicals Center. Unfortunately, his hopes for the latter venture were never realized due to a lack of political and financial support.

In addition to the role CLR plays in identifying work that needs to be done to further the development of a coordinated national bibliographic control system, Haas describes some of the other forces at work that would affect future library operations. These include the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the National Science Foundation. Regrettably, no mention is made of the program of the National Library of Medicine, which had achieved most of the objectives cited by Haas for successful cooperative library development.

Haas encourages the introduction of scientific management into library administration while cautioning that library management is not only a science. The ability to adjust direction as new evidence develops is crucial to the creation of new policy objectives.

19. "Managing the Information Revolution: CLR's Bibliographic Service Development Program." *Library Journal* 104 (September 15, 1979): 1867-70.

This paper was coauthored with Nancy E. Gwinn and C. Lee Jones, program officers at the Council on Library Resources. It reviews CLR's historical involvement in bibliographic control efforts and reveals its catalytic role in establishing a national program. The report defines the goals of the CLR Bibliographic Service Development Program and outlines how participation by libraries would be sought.

The most notable feature of this article is the exhortation for libraries to develop a willingness and capacity for change in order to take advantage of the emerging national bibliographic system.

20. "Libraries, Adapting to Change, Need Advice of Scholars." *Humanities Report* 2, no. 3 (March 1980): 2-3.

In a brief note, Haas points out that library users, especially humanists, must join forces with librarians to guide changes resulting from economic, technical, or political influences.

21. "Research Libraries and the Dynamics of Change." *Scholarly Publishing* 11 (April 1980): 195-202.

This well-written paper describes how the library profession has responded to technological change by introducing expanded service programs. Without increased financial support, libraries joined cooperative arrangements through which the benefits of resource sharing were made evident. In addition to these developments, libraries need to continue to seek improved ways to provide services. Haas points out that new strategies, "forced by economics and made possible by technology, are compelling research libraries to rethink their roles as part of the scholarly process."

He describes the changing bibliographic structure, which is becoming library-independent as a result of computerized consortial networks such as the Online Computer Library Center and the Research Libraries Information Network. The modern online catalog has also become the key management tool for acquisitions and collection control. Together, these improved library processes serve the research and scholarly enterprise.

This paper provides an excellent insight into the dynamics of change in libraries that result from economic realities and the rising expectations of their users.

22. "Role of the Liberal Arts." Abridged version of a paper given at the dedication of the Washington & Lee Library. *Washington & Lee Alumni Magazine* (July 1980): 4-6.

Haas describes the transformation taking place in modern libraries. He identifies the new bibliographic structure, which involves the use of computerized networks and computerized storage processing and transmission of information, as the essence of the "library revolution." These changes affect liberal education by making information more readily available for both teaching and learning.

He resists the usual impulse for librarians to build ever-larger collections. Instead, he suggests that the content of the collection should reflect the present needs of the liberal arts curriculum; books should come and go as needed and not simply be accumulated. This philosophy is both economically and educationally sound.

23. "Crisis in the College Library." *AGB Reports* (Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges) 23 (March/April 1981): 41-45.

This paper was coauthored with Nancy E. Gwinn, who at the time was Director of Program Coordination of The Research Libraries Group. They discuss the potential harm to college and university libraries that may result from budget cuts. Citing statistics from the Association of Research Libraries for the period 1974-1979, they point out that while funds expended for library materials rose by 50 percent, the average number of volumes acquired rose only 9 percent and the total number of periodicals declined by 3 percent. Inflation raised the cost of periodicals 17.5 percent annually; the cost of books rose 11.6 percent annually.

This difficult economic situation came at a time when libraries were also expected to apply new communications and computer technology to improve operations and services. Financial pressures have led libraries to explore more vigorously the possibilities of resource sharing through increased interlibrary loans, cooperative acquisitions and cataloging, and the use of computerized bibliographic networks.

24. "A Responsible and Exceptional Performance: Sterling Memorial Library 1930-1980." Paper presented at the fiftieth anniversary of the Sterling Library, October 10, 1980. *The Yale Library Gazette* 55 (April 1981): 145-60.

Haas discusses design characteristics of a modern research library. He analyzes the optimal requirements for designated functions involving the collection, staff, and users. He also points out that the transformation of libraries resulting from the introduction of new technologies is costly and not without risk. Planning the future research library calls for the involvement of senior academic officers and faculties.

Any person or group contemplating the construction of a new academic library should read this paper, which reviews the important philosophic and pragmatic considerations that, together, mold the research library setting.

25. "Network-Level Decisions." In *Information Technology: Critical Choices for Library Decision Makers*, 147-56. Proceedings of the Fourth Pittsburgh Conference, School of Library and Information Science, University of Pittsburgh, November 2-4, 1981. New York: Marcel Dekker, 1982.

Haas describes the need for better relationships between librarians and those persons who are engaged in planning networks. He expresses regret that even when librarians take part in the decision process, "the end result of their participation leaves something to be desired." Furthermore, he describes the confusion that exists among undifferentiated networks, na-

tional networks, state and regional networks, local and multicampus networks, and subject-oriented networks.

He calls for a reliable determination of the value of networks and urges libraries to take fuller advantage of their network affiliations. Given the number and diversity of existing network structures, he urges librarians to gain a thorough understanding of the capabilities of new network technologies. Without this knowledge, the responsibility for managing library networks will be taken over by others.

This hard-hitting, candid assessment of some deficiencies in librarian performance must have created some concern among professional librarians, especially library managers. It is difficult to determine whether it stimulated more interest in networking directly, or whether the developments that followed were simply in the pipeline at the time. It is clear, however, that Haas understood the complexity of network decision-making as well as the organizational and operational problems that can result from planning that does not take into account clearly specified library objectives.

26. "Computing in Documentation and Scholarly Research." *Science* 215, no. 4534 (February 12, 1982): 857-61.

This paper describes how computing and modern communications affect scholarly research and publication. It provides an excellent overview of the process of scholarly communication, along with a summary of systems objectives advanced by the National Enquiry into Scholarly Communication in 1979.

Haas reviews the pressures for change derived from the increasing rate and volume of publishing, dissatisfaction among users and providers, and administrators' concerns about rising costs. He summarizes the history of computer applications in cataloging and indexing, which led to better bibliographic control of the literature. Computer applications to improve the publishing process are described in the context of technologies and costs.

Haas makes a most important contribution by discussing major unresolved issues. He wisely considers information as both a public good and a commodity. He suggests that control of information is power, but that unconstrained access is a public good. One of the key issues is the role of government in the resolution of legal, commercial, and policy issues. The role of government as a major sponsor and producer of new knowledge is identified in the context of public-private sector tensions related to the provision of information services and products. The relationship of copyright issues to national information policy is included in his list of unresolved problems.

This article, in my judgment, represents one of Haas's most important publications, not only because of the scope and richness of its content but also because it appears in an international journal that has a very large and diverse readership among learned and influential groups. Some of the same observations and concepts that appear in more specialized library literature consequently seem to have had less influence.

27. "Networking Developments in the U.S. at the National Level." *INSPEL* 17 (1983): 200-206.

Haas reviews the development of American library networks in the context of a wide array of purposes. He points out that, historically, most networks were designed to provide computer-based bibliographic services. Starting with a description of the development of the first large-scale automated network (MEDLARS) at the National Library of Medicine in 1961, he provides a chronicle of the major systems that subsequently contributed to the provision of library services of benefit to individual users as well as society generally.

He describes the ongoing efforts to establish links between different computer systems to improve information transfer. The effort to develop a comprehensive name authority file to facilitate such linkage is described, along with a brief account of the online public access catalogs that were under development or in operation. This paper serves as an uncomplicated review of the highlights of library movements and developments that can be attributed to the wise application of new technologies for making library services more efficient and widespread.

28. "Library Research Projects in the National and University Context in the United States." In *Large Libraries and New Technological Developments*, edited by C. Rudijk, 169-74. Proceedings of a symposium held on the occasion of the inauguration of the new building of the Royal Library, The Hague. Munich: K.G. Saur, 1984.

Haas describes the work of the National Enquiry into Scholarly Communication and suggests that we need to know more about the work of scholars in relation to libraries. He presents some examples of research funded by CLR to better understand this relationship.

He reminds us that scholarship is international in nature and that the humanities continue to be central to the well-being of civilization; thus, the needs of scholars should be taken into account when examining the capabilities of new technologies to improve library services.

29. "The Development and Present Program of the Council on Library Resources." In *New Information Technologies and Libraries*: Proceedings of the Advanced Research Workshop organised by the European Cultural Foundation in Luxembourg, November 1984, to assess the Impact of New Information Technologies on Library Management, Resources, and Cooperation in Europe and North America, edited by H. Liebaers, W. J. Haas, and W. E. Biervliet, 43-49. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1985.

Haas discusses the history and programs of the Council on Library Resources.

30. "New Wine, New Bottles." In *International Librarianship Today and Tomorrow: A Festschrift for William J. Welsh*, compiled by Joseph W. Price and Mary S. Price, 53-64. Munich: K.G. Saur, 1985.

Haas concentrates on research library management in relation to changes in library services. He identifies a long list of topics requiring research and points out that libraries have a role to play in the research process. He categorizes the areas for study as (a) the research process in the new information setting, (b) user needs, resources, and access, and (c) bibliographic control.

Haas suggests that technology and its costs are the driving force to achieve new levels of library performance. Participation by librarians in the transformation of conventional libraries to modern information systems will bring more respect to the profession within society. Reshaping goals and operating methods is required to establish a better system for acquiring, storing, preserving, and distributing the accumulated printed record.

31. "IFLA and CLR, 1971-1987." *IFLA Journal* 13, no. 3 (1987): 227-28.

Haas provides a list of grants made by CLR to IFLA to characterize the close relationship between the two organizations.

32. "The Program of the Council on Library Resources." In *Les Bibliothèques: tradition et mutation: mélanges offerts à Jean-Pierre Clavel à l'occasion de son 65e anniversaire*, 91-101. Lausanne, Switzerland: Bibliothèque cantonale et universitaire, 1987.

This report describes the influence of the Council's programs on research library developments. It provides a remarkable insight into the transfor-

mation of libraries that occurred concurrently with three decades of CLR history. The diversity of CLR activities should attract the interest of nonlibrarians as well as librarians in efforts to extend or improve library and information systems. The reader will note that a new program agenda will seek to increase the number of individuals who are well qualified to plan, lead, and operate academic and research libraries.

33. "Information Studies, Librarianship, and Professional Leadership." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 76 (January 1988): 1-6.

Haas addresses the need to transform the profession of librarianship in fundamental ways. Pointing out that the profession was first based on an academic program one hundred years ago, he asks, "Can a profession that is based on procedures and processes survive in an undisciplined world?"

Reflecting on the changes that have taken place in universities in recent years, he indicates that libraries have fallen behind in responding to new university directions and are failing to establish specifications for their own future. He expresses concern that, despite some technical accomplishments, there is a mismatch between librarianship and the specialized world of scholarship, research, and teaching.

Citing the leadership of the Medical Library Association and the National Library of Medicine in promoting library education, including certification and continuing education, he suggests that the resulting higher standards have become the new norm for this field.

He identifies the major problems that need attention as: (1) the shortage of first-rate candidates for faculty positions in library schools, (2) the low visibility of librarianship and library professional education, (3) ambiguity in the definition of "libraries" and "librarianship," and (4) the paucity of sound research on many important topics and the lack of a research tradition on which to build.

Having made a critical analysis of the problems of professional librarianship, he describes how the profession needs to be strengthened, expanded, and redefined to include information studies, information science, and improved organization and management of information resources and services. Importantly, he suggests that a small number of national-level library schools with strong faculties might effect needed change more readily than the large number of weaker schools currently in existence.

As in some of his earlier publications concerned with other library problems, Haas provides a highly sophisticated and credible analysis of a set of complex problems, and points the way to finding reasonable alternative solutions. The assumption of important new responsibilities by librarians to engage in the technological and organizational transformation

taking place in our universities and information infrastructure is set forth clearly as a challenge for the profession.

Overview

This review of Warren J. Haas's publications that appeared during the past thirty-seven years reveals the remarkable progression and scope of his library interests. More than a quarter of a century ago, he identified the need for cooperative library services, including a national system to improve bibliographic access to library materials. He has stressed persistently the importance of preserving collections as well as improving the organization and management of libraries. He subsequently developed plans and programs that successfully dealt with these problems. These accomplishments are reported in other chapters of this book.

More recently, he has written about the need to manage libraries in the face of changing institutional and societal information requirements. He has called attention to the need to involve senior officers and faculty members in planning future library operations and services in relation to scholarship and education. To achieve a more efficient and responsive library system, he suggests that librarianship and professional education need to be upgraded through sophisticated information studies and more comprehensive and critical library education.

In short, Jim Haas has recognized important library problems, assessed their implications for service to users, and, through firm but eloquent persuasion, offered and delivered many of the solutions needed. He has been attuned to the dynamics for change and, accordingly, has effected improvements as a working librarian, library director, and foundation president. No librarian has done more to assist or improve library services to satisfy our national information requirements.

INDEX

Academic libraries. *See* College libraries; Research libraries
Access to library materials. *See* Bibliographic services; Research libraries
American Booksellers Association, 46
American Council of Learned Societies, 16
American Council on Education, 3
American National Standards Institute, 56
Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, Second Edition (AACR2), 27, 33
Association of American Universities, 11–12, 16, 17, 55–56
Association of College and Research Libraries, 66
Association of Research Libraries, 3, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 41, 45, 54, 66, 73, 86–87, 88, 91. *See also* Office of Management Studies
Atlanta University, 65
Automation. *See* Bibliographic services; Online catalogs; Research libraries—Computer technology
Avram, Henriette, 30
BALLOTS, 26, 29
Barrow, W. J., 11
Barrow Research Laboratory, 11
Battelle Laboratories, 31
Battin, Patricia, 12, 57
Berman, Sanford, 37
Bibliographic services, 21–39, 64, 75, 91, 95, 101
Bibliographic utilities, 22, 26, 30–32, 37–39. *See also* OCLC Online Computer Library Center; Research Libraries Group; Western Library Network
Bidlack, Russell, 12
Bok, Derek C., 48
Booz, Allen & Hamilton, 3–4, 14
The British Library, 27, 36
Brittle Books: Reports of the Committee on Preservation and Access, viii, 56–57
Bryant, Douglas, 41, 48, 74
Buildings. *See* Library architecture

Carnegie Corporation of New York, 15, 48, 49, 73
Case Western Reserve University, 65
Center for Research Libraries, 46
Clapp, Verner, 77, 79, 93
COHAYA project, 26
Cole, Fred, 3, 4, 9, 15, 73, 75, 77, 79, 93
College libraries, 14, 36, 42, 84, 85–86, 95–96
Columbia University, 1–2, 6, 7, 17, 26, 65, 66
Columbia University Libraries, 2–8, 11, 26, 42, 43, 48, 52, 60, 72, 89, 90–91
"The Columbia University Management Program," 89
Commission on Preservation and Access, 12, 27, 56–57, 79, 86–87
Computer technology. *See* Research libraries—Computer technology
"Computing in Documentation and Scholarly Research," 97–98
Consortia. *See* Library cooperation; OCLC Online Computer Library Center; Research Libraries Group; Western Library Network
"Cooperative Library Service for Higher Education," 84
Copyright, 46, 97–98
Council of Higher Educational Institutions, 84

Council on Library Resources, 44, 73, 75, 79, 82, 91, 93, 98–100. *See also* Commission on Preservation and Access
Academic Library Management Intern Program, 15, 66, 68
Bibliographic Service Development Program (BSDP), 10, 17, 22–24, 29–39, 74, 75, 94–95
Committee on Information Studies, 13
Committee on Preservation and Access, 56
Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity, 55
Faculty-Librarian Cooperative Research Grants, 13, 66, 68
Frontiers conferences, 12–13, 62
Internships for Recent Graduates of Library Schools, 13–14
Librarianship and Professional Education, 67
Linked Systems Project (LSP), 31–33, 37–38, 98
Professional Education and Training for Research Librarianship (PETREL), 12–13, 62, 63–64, 69
Research Library Committee, 17, 67
Research on Library Management and Operations, 67
Research Program, 16–17
Seminar on the Economics of Research Libraries, 91
Senior Fellows Program, 12, 66–67, 68
"The Council on Library Resources: The Fourth Decade," 67
Couper, Richard, 41, 43, 48
"Crisis in the College Library," 95–96
Dartmouth College, 34
deBary, W. Theodore, 8
"The Development and Present Program of the Council on Library Resources," 99
Dix, William, 23
Drucker, Peter, 5
Education for librarianship. *See* Professional education and training
Effective Access to Periodical Literature: A National Program, 10
Engley, Donald B., 42, 43
Exxon Education Foundation, 55
Festschrift for Margreet Wijnstroom, 80
Ford Foundation, 49, 73
Foundation Library Committee, 17–18, 73–75, 80
Frye, Billy, 56
Fussler, Herman, 23, 24, 29, 31
"Future Developments in Library Facilities in Independent Liberal Arts Colleges," 85–86
"Future Prospects," 91–93
Geac, 38
Gotwals, Joan, 30
Govan, James, 30
Harvard University Libraries, 26, 42, 48–49, 50
Hayes, Robert M., 16
"The History and Present Program of the Council on Library Resources," 93
Howe, Harold, 73
"IFLA and CLR, 1971–1987," 99
"The Impact of Institutional Change on Research Libraries in the United States," 88–89
Indiana University, 65
Information Industry Association, 28
Information policy, 97–98
"Information Studies, Librarianship, and Professional Leadership," 100–101
Interlibrary loan, 35–36, 43, 44, 45
International data exchange, 81
International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA), 57, 79–82, 93, 99
Internships. *See* Professional education and training
Ishimoto, Carol, 30
J. Matthews & Associates, 34
Johns Hopkins University, 53

Jones, C. Lee, 10
Kent State University, 65
Kusch, Polykarp, 2
Lakeway meeting, 34
Librarians. *See* Library profession; Professional education and training
"Libraries, Adapting to Change, Need Advice of Scholars," 94–95
Library architecture, 85–86
Library consortia. *See* Library cooperation
Library cooperation, 6–7, 41–51, 64, 84, 93–98, 101. *See also* Center for Research Libraries; Research libraries; Research Libraries Group
Library of Congress, 10, 21–22, 23, 24–26, 27, 29, 30, 31–33, 37–38, 42, 86–87, 91
  MAchine-Readable Cataloging (MARC), 22, 27, 29, 32, 33, 81
  name authority file, 32–33, 35, 37, 98
  National Coordinated Cataloging Program (NCCP), 32–33
  National Union Catalog (NUC), 21, 22–23
  National Preservation Program Office, 56
  subject headings, 37
Library profession, 100–101
"Library Research Projects in the National and University Context in the United States," 98–99
Library schools, 12, 15, 65, 66–67, 68, 87–88, 100–101. *See also* Professional education and training
Library systems, 84–85
Linowitz, Sol, 59
Louisiana State University, 65
Lydenberg, Harry Miller, 43
McBurney, Margot, 12
McDonald, John, 12, 74
MARC (MAchine-Readable Cataloging). *See* Library of Congress
"Management in Research Libraries: Implications for Library Education," vii, 68, 87–88
"Managing Change," 90–91
"Managing Our Academic Libraries: Ways and Means," 68, 93–94
"Managing the Information Revolution: CLR's Bibliographic Service Development Program," 94
Medical Library Association, 100
Mellon (Andrew W.) Foundation, 15, 48, 49, 71, 73, 75, 76
Mellon, Timothy, 48
MELVYL, 34
Metcalf, Keyes D., 43
Microfilming. *See* Preservation microfilming
Mid-Atlantic Preservation Service, 27, 55
Mohrhardt, Foster, 79
National Agricultural Library (NAL), 24, 25–26
National bibliographic system. *See* Bibliographic services
National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS), 10, 25, 27–28, 94
National Endowment for the Humanities, 15–16, 48, 57, 87, 94
National Enquiry into Scholarly Communication, 97–99
National libraries, 24–26. *See also* The British Library; Library of Congress; National Agricultural Library; National Library of Medicine
National Library of Medicine (NLM), 24, 25, 66, 87, 88, 94, 98, 101
A National Periodicals Center: Technical Development Plan, 10, 27
National Periodicals Center (NPC), 10–11, 27–29, 35–36, 74, 75, 76, 93–94
National Science Foundation, 60, 94
National Union Catalog (NUC). *See* Library of Congress
"Network-Level Decisions," 96–97

"Networking Developments in the U.S. at the National Level," 98
Networks. *See* Library cooperation; Library systems; OCLC Online Computer Library Center; Research Libraries Group; Western Library Network
"New Wine, New Bottles," 99
New York Public Library, 26, 29, 41, 43, 47, 48, 87
New York University, 38
North Carolina Central University, 65
Northwestern University, 66
Notes on *A Brief Narrative of the Case and Tryal of John Peter Zenger*, 90
Notes on *The Ordeal of the Union* by Allen Nevins, 90
OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc., 22, 26, 29, 30–32, 34, 36, 37–39, 41, 42, 47, 48, 50–51, 93–94, 95
Office of Management Studies (OMS), 3, 5, 14–15, 60
  Academic Library Program, 14
  Consultant Training Program, 14, 66, 75
  Institutes for Library Educators, 15, 65
  Management Review and Analysis Program, 60
  National Collections Inventory Project, 14
Office of University Libraries Management Studies. *See* Office of Management Studies
Ohio College Library Center. *See* OCLC Online Computer Library Center
Online catalogs, 30, 31, 33–35, 37, 74, 95, 98
"Organizational Structures to Meet Future Bibliographic Needs," 68, 91
Periodicals, 35–36, 43. *See also* National Periodicals Center; Research Libraries Group
Personal Bibliographic Software, Inc., 33
Personal Bibliographic System, 33
"The PETREL Program," 68
"Preparation of Detailed Specifications for a National System for the Preservation of Library Materials," 11, 54, 86–87
Preservation microfilming, 55–56, 87
Preservation of library materials, 11–12, 17, 74, 81, 86–87. *See also* Research libraries
Professional education and training, 12–15, 66–67, 68, 74, 75, 82, 87–88, 100–101. *See also* Library schools
"The Program of the Council on Library Resources," 99–100
"Program Statement for a Consortium of Research Libraries: Yale, New York Public Library, Harvard, Columbia," 45
Publishers and publishing, 10, 28, 35–36, 46, 97–98
Pusey, Nathan, 71
Racine Public Library, 83
Rayward, Boyd, 12
Research in library science, 66, 67, 74, 98–99, 100–101
Research libraries, 88–89, 95, 96, 101. *See also* Research Libraries Group
  cataloging, 42
  collection development, 14, 36, 64
  computer technology, 51, 64, 74, 98, 99
  finances, 51, 95–96
  management, 12, 14–15, 19, 38, 59, 64, 67, 68, 87–88, 90–91, 93–94, 99
  mission, 2–4
  organization, 3–7
  planning, 4, 7, 60, 72–73
  preservation, 53–55, 56, 64
  relations with library schools, 60–61, 66–67, 68

relations with other libraries, 36–39, 64, 88–89
relations with scholars, 24, 35–36, 37, 38–39, 64, 88–89, 91–93, 94–95, 98–99
staff, 14–15, 44, 64
use and users, 84
Research librarianship. *See* Library profession; Professional education and training
"Research Libraries and the Dynamics of Change," 95
Research Libraries Group, 6, 14, 17, 22, 26, 29, 30–32, 34, 37–39, 74, 90–91, 95
bibliographic access, 44
computer and communication systems, 44, 46, 47–48, 49
cooperative collection development, 43, 44, 46, 47–48
founding, 41–48, 72
finances, 47–48, 49
interlibrary loan, 45
management, 50
membership, 45, 50
program development, 49
Serials Task Force, 45
staff, 49
Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN). *See* Research Libraries Group
Research universities, 15–17, 24, 37, 51, 64, 76, 88–89, 96, 100–101
"A Responsible and Exceptional Performance," 96
Retrospective conversion. *See* Online catalogs
"A Review of Some Current Issues and Possible Solutions in the Bibliographical Control of Library Resources," 23, 24, 29, 31
Rockefeller Foundation, 73
Rogers, Rutherford D., 12, 41
"The Role of the Building Consultant," 86
"Role of the Liberal Arts," 95
Rosenthal, Joseph A., 44, 48
Rutgers University, 65
Sawyer, John E., 49, 71, 72, 73, 75
Scholarly communication, 64, 97–98
Skerryvore Foundation, 48
Skipper, James, 48, 74
Sloan (Alfred P.) Foundation, 48, 73
"Slow Fires," 57
Social Science Research Council, 17
Standards, 33, 34. *See also* American National Standards Institute
Stanford University, 26, 29, 47, 48
State University of New York at Buffalo, 65
"Statewide and Regional Reference Service," 84–85
"Student Use of New York's Libraries," 84
Sullivan, Richard, 73, 74
Telecommunications, 31–32, 33, 38–39, 49, 97–98
"Tragedy About to Happen: The Deterioration of Book Paper," 87
Transborder data flow. *See* International data exchange
U.S. Department of Education, 25
U.S. Office of Education, 11, 54, 60
U.S.–Japan Friendship Commission, 75
Universal Bibliographic Control, 81
Universities. *See* Research universities
University libraries. *See* Research libraries
University Libraries Management Study, 3
University Microfilms, Inc. (UMI), 35
University of Alabama, 65
University of British Columbia, 62
University of California, 34
University of California, Los Angeles, 12, 16, 62, 65, 66
University of Chicago, 12, 47, 48, 50, 65, 66
University of Chicago Library Data Management System, 26, 29, 30
University of Denver, 65
University of Georgia, 34, 66

University of Illinois at Chicago, 16, 66
University of Michigan, 12, 65, 66
University of Minnesota, 16
University of Missouri-Columbia, 66
University of Oklahoma, 65
University of Pennsylvania, 53
University of Tennessee, 65
University of Toronto Library Automated System (UTLAS), 29
University of Wisconsin-Madison, 66
Vosper, Robert, 79
Wagman, Frederick, 23
Washington Library Network. *See* Western Library Network
"We Knocked on Every Door," 83
Webster, Duane, 14
Welsh, William, 23
Western Library Network (WLN), 22, 29, 30–32, 37–39
Williams, Gordon, 11
Yale University Libraries, 26, 41, 42, 48, 65, 96

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Education
Research and
Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed

March 21,1991